THE

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

JUNE, 1880.

No. 283.

Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur.

NEW YORK:
D. APPLETON AND COMPANY.
1880.

COPYRIGHT BY
ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE.
1880.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

JUNE, 1880.

ART.		PAGE
I.	POPULAR FALLACIES ABOUT RUSSIA. By E. W. STOUGHTON	523
II.	DIVORCES IN NEW ENGLAND. By NATHAN ALLEN, M. D., LL. D.	547
III.	MCCLELLAN'S LAST SERVICE TO THE REPUBLIC. Part III. By GEORGE TICKNOR CURTIS	565
IV.	HAS THE SOUTHERN PULPIT FAILED? By the Rev. F. A. SHOUP, D. D.	585
V.	CASTE AT WEST POINT. By Professor PETER S. MICHIE	604
VI.	SOME INTERESTING PUBLICATIONS. I. Italy and her Invaders. II. Romances of the Middle Ages. III. Chaldean Legends of Genesis. IV. Explorations in Cambodia. By MAYO W. HAZELTINE	614

THE Editor disclaims responsibility for the opinions of contributors, whether their articles are signed or anonymous.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCLXXXIII.

JUNE, 1880.

POPULAR FALLACIES ABOUT RUSSIA.

The tendency of newspaper correspondence and magazine articles has been to create the impression that the Russian Empire is filled with seeds of disorder threatening insurrection and even revolution, unless immediate changes are made in its government to meet what are called the demands of the people. This literature is in the main of English origin, and is the offspring of that prejudice and hostility against Russia which, with few interruptions, have been active in England for the last hundred years. They originated indeed during the reign of the Empress Catharine II., who with all her faults —and they were few compared with those attributed to her—was the greatest and wisest female ruler who ever lived ; and, singularly enough, this hostility and prejudice arose from her refusal, while we were struggling for independence, to aid Great Britain in her contest with France and Spain ; or to effect for a bribe a European peace, that England, relieved from her Continental antagonists, might hurl upon our forefathers force enough to suppress their rebellion. From thence onward, Russia, her people and governments, have been through good and through evil report friends of this country, not failing to stand forth as such at a time when no other government in Europe would have mourned the dismemberment and consequent destruction of the Great Republic. We should not forget that the Emperor of Russia, who is charged with so oppressing his own people as to justify the murders and outrages

committed and threatened by the Nihilists, is the same humane and Christian monarch who in 1861, at the risk of his life and throne, liberated some forty-two millions of serfs—a grand achievement of liberty so conducted throughout his vast empire that not a drop of blood was shed in its accomplishment. We should remember also that in 1861 when Southern cannon echoed their thunders in Europe, and rulers there willingly believed them signal-notes of a dying nation, he, with an earnest sympathy entitling him to our lasting gratitude, and with a comprehensive appreciation of the value of our perpetual union, instructed his chancellor, Prince Gortchakoff, to declare to us "the deep interest with which the Emperor was observing the development of a crisis which puts in question the prosperity and even the existence of the Union"; that "for more than eighty years that it has existed the American Union owes its independence, its towering rise, and its progress, to the concord of its members, consecrated under the auspices of its illustrious founder by institutions which have been able to reconcile union with liberty. This union has been fruitful; it has exhibited to the world the spectacle of a prosperity without example in the annals of history. It would be deplorable that, after so conclusive an experience, the United States should be hurried into a breach of the solemn compact which, up to this time, has made up their power. . . .

"In spite of the diversity of their constitutions and of their interests, and perhaps even because of this diversity, Providence seems to urge them to draw closer the traditional bond which is the basis and the very condition of their political existence. In any event, the sacrifices which they might impose upon themselves to maintain it are beyond comparison with those which dissolution would bring after it. United they perfect themselves—isolated they are paralyzed. . . .

"This union is not simply in our eyes an element essential to the universal political equilibrium. It constitutes, besides, a nation, to which our august master and all Russia have pledged the most friendly interest; for the two countries, placed at the extremities of the two worlds, both in the ascending period of their development, appear called to a natural community of interests and of sympathies, of which they have already given mutual proofs to each other."

And this communication, so full of sympathy, so suggestive of aid, closes with the assurance that, "in every event, the American

nation may count upon the most cordial sympathy, on the part of the Emperor, during the important crisis which it is passing through at present."

A ruler who could, in the face of monarchical Europe, praise republican institutions in terms so exalted, and who so plainly saw their value in developing the resources, wealth, and happiness of a nation, can not be indifferent to the welfare of his own people, nor disposed to refuse them such political advantages and liberal institutions as they are able to appreciate and enjoy. It is, therefore, but just toward him and his Government to assume that, so soon as the Russian people—the mass of whom were so lately serfs—are capable of exercising that political liberty which a representative government involves, they will be permitted to enjoy it. Indeed, I have the highest authority for saying that such is the purpose of the Imperial Government, and that, for some time past, it has been earnestly considering a plan by which, in anticipation of a more general basis of representation, a partial one may be adopted by which the great interests of all portions of the empire can be represented at St. Petersburg. It is not surprising that even the highest and most humane intelligence should doubt the wisdom of conferring upon serfs so lately liberated the right to choose representatives to assist in the government of a great empire. Nor do they desire it. The assassins who have lately signalized their unfitness for liberty, or even to live except among savages and outlaws, do not belong to the liberated class, or indeed to any one of the industrial classes of Russia. They are few in number, having no organization except for purposes of outrage and murder; no plan to change or reform the Government; no theory except to destroy, and to live without labor upon the plunder of others. Nihilism is a doctrine at which even the Kearneys, the Socialists, the Communists shudder. It proposes the destruction of all that holds even the vilest society together. Its first mission is declared by its founder to be to destroy the "lie," and "the first lie is God. When we are rid of this," says the loathsome missionary, "and are convinced that our existence and that of the surrounding world is due to the conglomeration of atoms in accordance with the laws of gravity, then and then only shall we have accomplished the first step toward liberty, and will experience less difficulty in ridding the mind of the second lie, which is *right*, invented by *might*, which makes and unmakes laws." And he declares that "when our minds are freed from the fear of a God, and from that childish respect for the fiction of *right*, all the

remaining chains which bind us, and which are called science, civilization, property, marriage, morality, and justice, will snap asunder like threads."

Such is the doctrine of the wretches who have attracted so much attention by their murders and attempts at murder, and who among the ignorant and the perverted have even secured sympathy, upon the notion that they were oppressed, and were engaged in some work of political reform.

A little reflection should convince persons of ordinary intelligence that they intend no reform. I have stated their purpose to destroy, to extirpate all religious belief, all law and its administration, the institution of marriage, and everything which the most enlightened of our race have been taught to respect and to love. When this is accomplished what will Nihilism give instead? what does it promise? Nothing, absolutely nothing but this: that when all of belief, all of law, of order, of institutions which we have inherited from the past shall be destroyed, blotted out so that every human being shall be upon an equality, but without protection of law or magistrate, and therefore the weak at the mercy of the strong and brutal, that *might* which the hideous throng of those who would create this pandemonium may see fit to exercise is to be employed by the majority in number, to establish such a government as shall repudiate God and marriage, the right of property, and of all else except the privilege of living at the mercy of the loathsome crew who are then to assume control.

I need not say to those who know anything of the character of the Russian peasant, of his respect for law, his veneration for his church, his devotion to God, that he abhors the Nihilists, their doctrines and purposes; and, among those who have been arrested and tried, he has rarely been found. Nor have outrages been instigated or committed by the laboring or industrial classes, but usually by half-educated, excitable students, who, although educated at slight expense except that borne by the Government, become impatient of religious teaching, and of all wholesome control; and by a few desperate characters who skulk from the police, poison the minds of those capable of being captivated by pernicious doctrines, and finally lead them to attempt the most terrible crimes. These wretches are sometimes aided by women paraded as belonging to respectable families and even to the nobility, but who are usually of a class to whom the doors of decent houses are never opened. It is difficult to understand how such persons can be regarded as reformers.

They do not in Russia represent the property, intelligence, or the industry of its people, and those who have studied their career must have observed that they have never proposed definite reforms, nor indeed any changes which did not strike at the very foundations of society and government. Nevertheless, it has been assumed by portions of the English press, and sometimes by our own, and is now believed by many in this country, that the efforts of the Nihilists to murder and destroy are to obtain relief from an oppressive government, and that a large part of the population of Russia is subjected, by the tyranny and exactions of a despotic, cruel, and irresponsible authority, to great and almost unendurable hardship and suffering. Persons thus believing assign to the Nihilists and to their assassinations a national and even patriotic purpose, and are inclined for that reason to justify the most atrocious means for the end supposed to be sought. It is the purpose of the Nihilists to create this impression, and, by the aid of a portion of the English press not unwilling to circulate statements calculated to injure the Russian Government and nation in the esteem of the world, this end has been to some extent attained—a result which would be of less consequence if the impression had not penetrated the minds of our own citizens—greatly to the injustice of a Government whose rule at home and influence abroad have long been marked by wise and honorable statesmanship, and generally by an enlarged benevolence, especially toward the oppressed Christian populations of Europe.

It is not perhaps remarkable that England should regard Russia with distrust and dislike. She believes it has long been the imperial purpose to occupy India. Wise and liberal English statesmen do not, I think, share this apprehension, nor do those who have means of learning the real purposes of the Russian Emperor. He would fail to find in India that source of revenue which, under the most grinding and oppressive taxation ever adopted, except perhaps in Egypt, enables the British Government to draw annually from a starving population some sixty-five millions sterling, more than eighteen millions of which is expended in England for the administration there of the Indian Government, and in paying pensions, annuities, interest, etc. This vast revenue has been obtained, among other sources, by a tax of between six and seven millions sterling—some thirty-three million dollars—upon salt, an article of prime necessity for both poor and rich in a hot climate, and by a tax upon such incomes as amount to seventy-five cents per week. The Government which rules this people of one hun-

dred and eighty or ninety millions by a viceroy and his council, without the least native representation, has found it necessary to employ an army at an annual expense to the ruled of from seventeen to more than twenty-five millions sterling—a sum in excess of the cost of the entire military establishment of Russia. The numerous colonies and dependencies of the British Empire, India excepted, are governed at an aggregate cost somewhat exceeding the revenues received; but the unhappy and famine-stricken populations of that country contribute by taxation largely to the national and individual incomes of the English people, who, by superior strength and military resources, maintain in poverty and wretchedness that vast inheritance of human beings which Warren Hastings and others conquered for England by an infamy of cruelties which the eloquence of Burke has made immortal. This inheritance Russia does not covet, nor would she hold it by a taxation which bares and bleaches the very bones of a people taught by their religion to bow submissively to a fate which makes their journey from the cradle to the grave a pilgrimage of hopeless toil, suffering, and starvation. Not only does the tax-gatherer seize all except what he deems barely enough to sustain life, but the Government is constantly increasing the burdens of its victims by enlarging the debt of India, which from 1869 to 1878 was increased more than fifty millions sterling. How the load of taxation is to be borne necessary to meet increasing interest charged upon this doomed race surpassed even the ingenuity of the late Ministry, for it was admitted, by the pliant instruments which obeyed the nod and worked the will of Lord Beaconsfield in India, that every resource of the ghastly and swarming millions of that ancient land which greed and avarice could discover had already been levied upon to support a government in comparison with which that of their dethroned princes was humane and merciful. Hence the two or three millions sterling contributed by Indian taxation and pledged as a famine fund were seized by the fallen Ministry to pay the expenses of a war waged to establish a "scientific frontier"—a wickedness which, without accomplishing its purpose, has dethroned a rightful ruler and destroyed thousands of his people.

What I have said of the oppressive taxation of India is founded upon the statements of English officials and English writers, some of whom have denounced the rule of Great Britain as more intolerable than that which prevailed before the atrocities of Hastings planted a Christian flag upon pagan soil. The constant fear

that Russia intends to seize India leads England to imagine that every march of Russian troops to a Russian outpost in Asia is a threat to invade India. It is an idle fear, and yet it is this and the equally groundless apprehension that Russia designs to occupy Constantinople which have led to the bolstering of Turkey by Great Britain; have made the massacre of tens of thousands of Bulgarian and Greek Christians by the Turks possible; and, finally, made it necessary for Russia, in the interests of humanity, single-handed, at the sacrifice of many thousands of lives and millions of treasure, to substantially destroy a power which for generations had been the scourge and the curse of Europe. It is a mistake to suppose that this war was waged for purposes of conquest. It was forced upon the Emperor by the religious sentiment of his people, long outraged by atrocities committed upon their Christian neighbors the Bulgarians too horrible to describe; and, when war was finally declared, it was but the cry of the Russian nation for vengeance upon great offenders against the human race. And so impressed were the English people by these horrors, that their Government was compelled to stand with folded arms and witness the chastisement of its ancient ally, while the rest of Europe looked on with approval. I know the reluctance with which the Emperor engaged in this contest, and have high authority for saying that it was long postponed, in the hope that such joint action of the great powers would be taken as would force the Turk to stay his indiscriminate butchery of women, children, and unarmed men. England refused to unite for this purpose; the Czar declared war, and then moved upon the enemies of the Christian race. They were finally conquered, and the flag of the victors, after many battles, waved at the gates of Constantinople. These might have been entered without firing a shot or the loss of a man, but the Emperor, conscious that the power of the Turk in Europe was annihilated, stayed the march of his columns at San Stefano, and there dictated terms of peace. These were embodied in the treaty bearing that name, and this was submitted to the Congress of Berlin, where it underwent many changes, the purpose of Lord Beaconsfield being to reduce within as narrow territorial limits as possible that freedom which Europe was to guarantee to the Bulgarians; and it was the boast of this representative of a Christian power, when the labors of that Congress ended, that the area of civil and religious freedom prescribed by Russia in the Treaty of San Stefano had by that of Berlin been vastly circumscribed. The chief tenderness

displayed by Lord Beaconsfield in the Congress was for the Jews, while his greatest solicitude was for the Turk, who was to guard the gates of the East against the march of Russia.

I have never doubted that the foreign policy of Lord Beaconsfield would be condemned by the British people, but I had not supposed he would give them the opportunity to do so until Parliament should approve of all he had done, for I deemed him too astute to exchange a certainty for an uncertainty, and not at all confident that dramatic displays upon the vast theatre he occupied would be accepted at the polls for wise statesmanship. He did not disappoint expectation, but held his Parliament firmly in hand until it had entered its seventh and last year of constitutional life ; and, as it was about expiring, he so dissolved it as to maintain his well-earned reputation for startling surprises, for his purpose was concealed, not only from his political antagonists, but from some of his inferior followers. If his object was to rout his adversaries, by a sudden manœuvre, before they could unite their forces for the fray, he has been disappointed ; for, under great, eloquent, and skillful leaders, they were so marshaled as to pronounce, by an overwhelming majority, a condemnation of his Ministry as decisive and withering as any ever before recorded by the deliberate judgment of the British people.

This policy has imposed heavy burdens upon the English nation. A legacy of troubles, involving the wisest statesmanship to compose, has been devolved upon the new Ministry, and a load of taxation, which no budget can evade or conceal, must be proposed, to meet obligations which the Government is pledged to perform. It will greatly embarrass Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues to deal with some of the problems they must solve. Treaties made by their predecessors they must observe, and these, if faithfully executed, demand great sacrifices. Thus, the Treaty of Berlin and the secret treaty conveying Cyprus, in some of their provisions, are not only hostile to the views of the new Ministry, but highly detrimental to the solid and permanent interests of Great Britain ; and yet these provisions must be executed so long as the treaties are substantially observed by the Porte. Mr. Gladstone, for instance, is an earnest Christian statesman, who appreciates the stupendous mistake committed by his predecessors in forcing at Berlin the yoke of the Turk upon the Bulgarian Christians after Russia had removed it in the field, and by treaty at San Stefano. He knows, too, the grave mistake committed in not conciliating that people instead of making

them feel that the Russians, not the English, were their friends, for it is probably their mission to possess and hold Constantinople and the straits as the trustee of nations—a position no first-rate power would be willing to occupy.

The gratitude the Greeks owe to Russia is of much the same character, for they, too, owe their national independence substantially to her assistance. British statesmen, at Berlin, might have secured the gratitude of both Greeks and Bulgarians by a simple recognition of their well-founded claims; but Lord Beaconsfield, unable to realize that the Turk was doomed, by the forces of a civilization he could not resist, to speedy decay in Europe, sought to preserve the outer shell of a rotten empire. He failed to see that this supposed bulwark against the imaginary march of Russia eastward would be worse than useless if the bulwark itself must be propped and sustained by the power of England. It remains for Mr. Gladstone and the liberal-minded statesmen he has called about him to coöperate with the powers represented at Berlin in doing justice to both Greeks and Bulgarians, by yielding, to the former, geographical limitations prescribed in the Treaty of Berlin, and, to the latter, that liberty from Turkish oppressions—south as well as north of the Balkans—which it was the glory of the representatives of Christian England to curtail. It was, on the contrary, the glory of Prince Gortchakoff that he in the Congress endeavored to give the Bulgarians a territory comprehending their entire nationality, and to the Greeks their enlarged boundaries; and before his departure for the Congress, when the question was suggested whether the Greeks could be properly represented there he said, if not represented, they could surely be heard, to press their claims; and in that connection he more than once declared with emphasis, "I will be the advocate of the Greeks in the Congress."

When telegrams were received announcing that this aged and venerated statesman was sick unto death, I had faith that he would live to rejoice with the Christian world over the victory of the Liberals in Great Britain; and it would not much surprise me should he survive long enough to agree with their Ministry upon an Eastern policy of such breadth and wisdom as to remove the fears which continually haunt the English mind that Russia designs to invade India, or at least to occupy Constantinople. This accomplished, and harmonious relations would soon exist between the peoples of both nations. England is strong enough to hold her empire against all but the explosion of internal forces, and she would better display

this strength by a calm and unruffled front than by a constant nervous agitation—the usual expression of weakness and fear.

I have at greater length than I had intended presented facts to show the deep interest which in our day Russia has taken in the welfare of the suffering Christians of the Turkish Empire, and how much she has sacrificed to promote this welfare. It may be said that the motive of the Emperor in so doing was to weaken and finally to destroy his ancient enemy, and not to benefit the oppressed. This is a cheap if not cowardly criticism, and is generally urged by those destitute of the virtues of generosity and benevolence, who would excuse their absence by denouncing them as ambition and avarice when exercised by others.

It is remarkable that the sympathy heretofore extended by Russia to the Greek nation existed in 1778 in the mind of the Empress Catharine. The English Minister then at her court was Mr. Harris, afterward Earl of Malmesbury, whose grandson edited his diaries and correspondence, to which I shall refer. He was sent to Russia during our Revolutionary war, for the purpose of negotiating an alliance offensive and defensive between that power and Great Britain—one object being to secure aid against France, that England might turn a sufficient force upon her American colonies to crush their rebellion. He struggled long and earnestly to accomplish this; and finally, when these efforts failed, he attempted, by means of a bribe offered to the Empress by authority of his Government, to induce her, while acting as mediatrix, to promote peace between the contending parties—a position demanding the utmost impartiality—so to conclude it as to make the withdrawal of the French fleets and armies from the American colonies a condition, that Great Britain, thus relieved from her Continental antagonists France and Spain, might the more easily reduce her colonies to subjection.

Mr. Harris was not fortunate in his attempt to accomplish this alliance, and in June, 1779, he writes to his Government in a despondent tone:

> I am fully satisfied, as well from what I hear as from my own experience, that we have nothing to expect from this court in the common course of negotiation. The leading men here are too rich for corruption, too headstrong to be persuaded, and too ignorant to listen to plain truth and conviction. . . . The present reigning idea—and it carries away all others—is the establishing a new empire in the East, at Athens or Constantinople. The Empress discoursed a long while with me the other day on the ancient Greeks;

of their alacrity and the superiority of their genius, and the same character being still extant in the modern ones, and of the possibility of their again becoming the first people if properly assisted and seconded. She told me she talked this language to me, as she knew my father was an admirer of the Greeks, and that she hoped I inherited his predilection. I mention this, my lord, not for the sake of repeating with ostentation the marks of distinction with which she honors me, but with a view of hinting to your lordship that, if his Majesty (the King of Great Britain) should stand in indispensable need of assistance from this quarter, the only means of obtaining it is by encouraging this romantic idea. She is so warmly bent on it that such a conduct dexterously managed would give us the firmest hold of this court: *and as its execution, whenever seriously planned, would instantly appear impracticable*, we need not be apprehensive of having engaged ourselves too far in an unpleasant transaction. Having suggested thus much, your lordship will improve on it as in your better judgment you should think proper. I must only entreat your lordship to consider it as written in the greatest confidence, and submitted as a proof of my zeal, not to be employed uselessly.

It is not difficult to understand why an intelligent man, giving utterance to sentiments so base, should have been anxious to conceal them from all but the person to whom they were addressed. The leading men were too rich to be bribed, and too obstinate to be persuaded by the arguments of Mr. Harris; but he discovered that the Empress was filled with the noble desire to relieve the suffering Greeks from the cruelties they had for generations suffered under the rule of the Turk—believing that, if properly assisted and seconded, they would resume their old rank among the nations of the earth. He therefore suggested that, should aid from Russia become indispensable, it might be obtained, and France and Spain be defied and the colonists humbled, by humoring this grand scheme of Greek emancipation and independence, and pretending to unite with the Empress for its accomplishment; and this method of securing assistance, he suggested, would be cheap, for it would only be necessary, when she should demand the promised aid for the Greeks, to refuse it upon the ground that her purpose was not only romantic but impracticable. It is to be regretted that such insincerity has too frequently marked the conduct of Great Britain toward the Greeks from that time to the present; and, although it is quite generally assumed that Greek independence is largely due to her efforts, this is a grave mistake, for the Greeks owe this mainly to the friendship, services, and sacrifices of Russia. This can be established by a few brief statements. In 1827, when Canning was Prime Minister, a treaty was concluded between Russia, Great Brit-

ain, and France, by which they undertook to relieve the Greeks by force, if necessary, from the shocking misgovernment of the Turk, and especially to prevent a continuance of outrages which the helpless Greeks of all ages and both sexes had for generations suffered. It had been the policy of the English Government to uphold the Turk and resist all efforts to dismember his empire, or reduce his power; but Canning was not only a statesman of a high order, but full of love for his race and anxious to relieve it from tyranny in all forms. He therefore cordially united in the treaty I have mentioned, warmly sympathizing with that oppressed people. Unfortunately for them, Canning died shortly after the treaty was signed, and was very soon succeeded as Prime Minister by the Duke of Wellington, who almost immediately cast about, as his published letters show, for some pretext on which to evade or abandon it, insisting, with a suspicion which has become hereditary in the English mind, that the purpose of the Russian ruler was, not to help the Greeks, but to aggrandize his empire. In October, 1827, and during Lord Goderich's brief administration which immediately preceded that of the Duke, the battle of Navarino was fought, in which the entire fleet of Turkey and Egypt was destroyed by the combined fleets of Russia, France, and England. This victory, which has been commonly attributed to the English, was the result of an engagement brought on by accident rather than design—the purpose of the three admirals commanding the combined fleet being to induce the Turkish commander, Ibrahim Pasha, to discontinue the war of extermination he had long conducted against the Greeks, and which, by treaty, the three powers had engaged to terminate—it being supposed the Porte would, without contest, yield to the superior force thus united for that purpose. It was understood, however, that actual force was not to be employed until absolutely necessary to accomplish the purpose of the treaty and of the secret article appended thereto. When, therefore, the combined fleets entered the Greek waters, and arrayed themselves in front of the Turkish and Egyptian ships without intending an attack, shots were discharged by the latter, which soon brought on a general engagement, resulting in the utter destruction of their entire fleet. On the 29th of January, 1828, Parliament assembled, and the King's speech, alluding to this, stated: "His Majesty deeply laments that this conflict should have occurred with the naval force of an ancient ally; but he still entertains the hope that this untoward event will not be followed by further hostilities," etc. The use of this lan-

guage gave rise to a most violent debate on the motion to adopt the address from the throne, in the course of which the ablest men on both sides participated. It was denied that the Turk had been the ancient ally of England; and the language employed by Mr. Burke was quoted by Lord Holland to show that the Turkish Empire was unworthy a place in the European system.

"I have never before heard it held forth," said Burke, "that the Turkish Empire has ever been considered as any part of the balance of power in Europe. They despise and contemn all Christian princes as infidels, and only wish to subdue and exterminate them and their people. What have these worse than savages to do with the powers of Europe, but to spread war, destruction, and pestilence among them? The ministers and the policy which shall give these people any weight in Europe will deserve all the bans and curses of posterity. All that is holy in religion, all that is moral and humane, demands an abhorrence of everything which tends to extend the power of that cruel and wasteful empire. Any Christian power is to be preferred to these destructive savages."

In the House of Commons, Mr. Brougham said that "he wished at once to record his dissent from that paragraph of the speech which designated the affair of Navarino as an occurrence to be lamented, but which he would term a glorious, brilliant, decisive, and immortal achievement. It has been reserved," he said, "for some of the men of these times to triumph and to be afraid—to conquer and to repine—to fight as heroes did the contest of freedom, and still to tremble like slaves—to act gloriously and repine bitterly—to win by brave men the battle of liberty in the East, and, in the West, to pluck from the valiant brow the laurels which it had so nobly earned, and plant the cypress in their stead because the conqueror had fought for religion and liberty."

The Duke of Wellington, who soon after became Prime Minister, maintained that the epithets in the royal speech which had excited such disapprobation and comment were in both instances fairly and truly applicable; that the Ottoman Empire had long been an ally of his country; that the Ottoman power was an essential part of the balance of power in Europe; and that its preservation had been for a considerable number of years an object not only to this country, but to the whole of Europe.

These views he stubbornly maintained after he became Prime Minister, and, as his published correspondence shows, resolved not to

execute the treaty entered into between the three powers for the protection of the oppressed Greeks—declaring that the purpose of the Russian Emperor in so doing was not to benefit that down-trodden race, but in some manner to aggrandize and benefit himself—how or in what respect he did not explain; nor was it possible that either power could, in executing that treaty, which did not stipulate for Greek independence, acquire territory or the least selfish advantage, its sole object being to compel the Turks to cease their massacres of a defenseless people.

That of which the Empress Catharine talked and dreamed, but was unable to achieve, her grandson Nicholas accomplished, by extorting from the unwilling but conquered Porte recognition of Greek independence by the Treaty of Adrianople in 1829. After exhausting all peaceful means, he in April, 1828, declared war against the Turks, and after many hard-fought battles their armies were defeated, and Adrianople was occupied by Russian troops; when the Sultan, fearing his powerful enemy would march upon Constantinople, sued for peace, which was granted upon condition that he should acknowledge the independence of Greece; and thus, after the lapse of many centuries, the Greeks, by the aid of Russia, again assumed a place among the nations of the earth. For this inestimable service the Emperor required of them no compensation—no advantages. The event was hailed with approval by all nations and governments except that of Great Britain, which frowned upon the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire. It was fortunate for the Greeks that Great Britain was not permitted to interfere in the formation of this treaty, for they would not have been more fairly treated by Wellington in 1829 than they were a half-century later by Lord Beaconsfield, who discouraged them from uniting with Russia in her late war upon the Turks by the promise that, if they remained neutral, their interests should be better served than they could be by joining the Russian armies. Greece believed this, and has since had abundant cause to repent her confidence, for, at the Congress of Berlin, Lord Beaconsfield strongly objected even to recommending Turkey to grant any definite extension of Greek boundaries; and, when against his opposition these were fixed, he has ever since declined, upon different pretexts, to unite with the powers of Europe in demanding of the Sultan performance of this condition.

I now recur to the just and generous conduct displayed toward us by the Empress Catharine during our Revolutionary struggle—

a conduct repeated by her imperial descendant, now upon the throne, during the dark hours of our civil contest.

To resist France, Great Britain had been compelled to employ most of her naval and military power, instead of turning it upon and crushing the colonists. The war between these powers seriously disturbed the peace and prosperity of Europe, and greatly interfered with its commerce, toward which the armed ships of Great Britain adopted an oppressive and unjust policy, stopping, searching, and seizing vessels, and claiming the right to consider as contraband of war some of the most important products of northern Europe. This led the Empress to project, about the close of the year 1778, the treaty of the armed neutrality, designed by the states joining it to resist the maritime outrages to which their commerce was thus subjected. The personal character of the Empress was such as gave her great influence over the northern courts, and also that of Vienna; and, the attitude of France being such as to make the Government of Great Britain extremely anxious to form an offensive and defensive alliance with Russia, Mr. Harris, in January, 1778, was, as before stated, especially instructed to obtain such a treaty, if possible. He had been told early in April, 1778, soon after his arrival in St. Petersburg, that the French Court had agreed to acknowledge the independence of the Americans, which, he says, filled him with indignation, and he declared, in a letter written in May of that year, that "the conduct of the Court of Versailles from the first period of our American contest has been fraught with duplicity, baseness, and low cunning"; and he added: "I have endeavored to make them see it in that light here, but have only succeeded in drawing from the Empress a civil answer and lukewarm expressions of friendship. I wish I could promise myself any hopes of succeeding in making her fulfill even these lukewarm expressions; but I find her character so different from what I was told it was, and her good-will toward us so changed, that it will require, I believe, my greatest efforts to prevent her doing harm instead of prevailing on her to do us good."

And in a previous letter, written in April, he says, "If they" (the Empress and her ministers) "should desert us in the hour of trial, I flatter myself no imputation of neglect will be laid to my charge."

It was indeed an hour of trial for Great Britain. While endeavoring to conquer to absolute subjection her American colonies, France had appeared as their champion, and England was thus con-

fronted by one of the most powerful nations of Europe. To subjugate her colonies was no easy task, but to do this, and carry on a European war of magnitude, would require the straining of every nerve unless powerful aid could be secured; and, to get this, Great Britain was ready to humble herself in the person of her representative before the Empress, who was implored to enter into the proposed alliance. That accomplished, France would be checkmated, and to crush the rebellious Americans would then be, it was supposed, comparatively easy.

About the middle of May Mr. Harris writes, "There is no disposition here to agree to our alliance even on any terms"; and he in the same month again writes, "The friendship of this country partakes of its climate—a clear, brilliant sky, with a cold, freezing atmosphere."

In November, 1778, he was still endeavoring to form this alliance, and declared it to be his purpose to obtain a personal interview with the Empress on the subject, as he doubted if his views reached her through her ministers. This audience he did not, however, obtain until September, 1779, when he urged her to make a strong and spirited declaration to the Courts of Versailles and Madrid—Spain having at that time united with France in the contest—and to support that declaration by an immediate considerable naval armament. She declined this proposal, and hinted, says Mr. Harris, "*at our being able to restore peace by renouncing our struggle with the colonies.*"

This interview seems to have discouraged him in his efforts to secure the coveted alliance, and his failure with her and with those who were, as he had said, "too rich to be bribed and too obstinate to be convinced," seems to have worked a change in his estimate of their characters and purposes. In June, 1779, he had praised the Empress as a great adept in English gardening, and added that, from conversing on this subject, "we got to Blackstone, where she soon led me out of my depth, as I believe she would many a circuiter, being most perfectly mistress of our laws and constitution."

Writing in January, 1778, he says: "Prepared even as I was for the magnificence and parade of this court, yet it exceeds in everything my ideas; to this is joined the most perfect order and decorum. The Empress herself unites in the most wonderful manner the talent of putting those she honors with her confidence at their ease, and of keeping up her own dignity. Her character extends throughout her whole administration, and, although she is rigidly

obeyed, yet she has introduced a lenity in the mode of government to which, till her reign, this country was a stranger."

This estimate, formed with sufficient deliberation, he afterward exchanged for one very discreditable to them all, when he discovered that his mission was profitless and his efforts to secure aid from the Empress hopeless. His Government was greatly alarmed at the project of the armed neutrality, and through him proposed to the Empress that, if she would abandon it, secret instructions should be given to all British men-of-war not to stop or search Russian vessels; but she, with the same romantic ideas as to fairness and justice which had surprised Mr. Harris when she spoke of the Greeks, was so impressed with a sense of duty toward sister nations who had trusted her as their ally, that she declined a proposal which was to benefit her commerce at their expense. She might, indeed, have largely increased her own by accepting the bait, for her flag would have safely covered all cargoes carried under it, at a period when that of Great Britain was the scourge of the seas.

Finally, the efforts of Mr. Harris having utterly failed to induce the Empress to join an alliance which would have involved her in war with France and Spain, she, at the request of those powers and of Great Britain, consented to act as mediatrix with the Emperor of Austria, for the purpose of composing Europe by establishing a peace between the contending powers. She was, of course, bound to act toward the three Powers with entire justice and impartiality, and yet, when it was understood that she would accept the position, another and most extraordinary (not to say disgraceful) effort was made by the Government of Great Britain, through Mr. Harris, to induce her to violate the duty she was to perform, the circumstances of which I shall briefly state.

In the course of conversation between Prince Potemkin, one of the Ministers of the Empress, and Mr. Harris, it was suggested that, if she could effect a peace to the satisfaction of his Government, it might be induced to cede to her, in consideration of the service, the Island of Minorca, the transaction to be kept a profound secret from France until peace should be secured, as possession by Russia of that island would place enmity between the two nations; and, of course, with a knowledge by France of the bribe, she would decline to accept the Empress as mediatrix. Considerable correspondence upon this subject transpired between Mr. Harris and his Government, when, finally, Lord Stormont, then Minister of Foreign Affairs, on the 20th of January, 1781, during a very dark pe-

riod of our Revolutionary war, wrote to his Minister that "his Majesty, after taking the opinion of his confidential servants, has empowered me to authorize you to mention the conditions upon which alone so great and important a cession can be made :

"The Empress of Russia shall effectuate the restoration of peace between Great Britain, France, and Spain upon the following terms, viz. : The Treaty of Paris, in 1762, shall be the basis of the treaty to be made. It shall be renewed with such alterations only respecting the possessions of the contracting parties as the events of the war have made. . . . It shall be an express condition that the French immediately evacuate Rhode Island, and every other part of his Majesty's colonies in North America. No stipulation or agreement whatever shall be made with respect to his Majesty's rebellious subjects, *who can never be suffered to treat* through the medium of a *foreign power*. If the Empress of Russia will effect such a peace as is here described, the King will in that case cede to her Imperial Majesty, and to the imperial crown of Russia, the Island of Minorca ; this cession to take place as soon as possible after the preliminaries of the above-described peace are signed.

"Though the cession must be conditional, and can not be made till after the service is performed, yet the effectual engagement may be entered into immediately, but must for many reasons be kept absolutely secret for the present."

The Empress was extremely anxious to secure possession of an island in the Mediterranean where her fleets could have been moored and her naval power increased, and Minorca she would have regarded as of inestimable value. The service she was to perform in return was almost as easy as lying, for she was only to violate her duty by securing a peace which her great influence and supposed impartiality could, it was believed, accomplish—being careful to conceal that she was so doing for a bribe, which would put lasting enmity between her empire and that of France, the power trusting in her impartiality and justice. And this service was proposed through a minister who stated, in a communication to his Government, that he had declared to one of the advisers of the Empress that, should the King of Prussia be joined in the mediation, "we could no longer consider it as an impartial one," although it was not suggested that the Great Frederick had been bribed, or was likely to be, by the French King.

I need not suggest, what is quite apparent, that the answer of the Empress to this proposal might have been the turning-point in

our Revolutionary war; for, with peace between France, Spain, and England, and the French fleets and armies withdrawn from us, and our forefathers interdicted from communicating with Great Britain through any foreign power, they would have been isolated, unsupported, and, if not crushed, would have been forced to sacrifice many more of their precious lives, with a postponement of their independence for a generation.

The Empress declined this proposition—declared that she "would not be led into temptation," and answered it by the following communication, written in her own hand:

"Her Imperial Majesty is extremely sensible of the friendly offer the Court of London has made her: she has already said, and, again repeats, that she shall be most happy to contribute for Great Britain a just and honorable peace; that she will work strenuously with her colleague to effect this end; and, if she should be fortunate enough to succeed, she then with the greatest pleasure will enter into the closest connection with England, and cement this connection by any means the most likely to render it useful, sincere, and lasting. As long, however, as she is employed as mediatrix, his Britannic Majesty must be sensible she can not, with any propriety, enter even into an eventual convention with him; since, as the object of this convention must sooner or later transpire, it will appear on some future day as if she had, during the mediation, been influenced by one of the belligerent powers, and her impartiality and justice might be called in question."

This answer, polite as became the great monarch who wrote it, conveyed a reproach which should have been felt even by the King and his ministers to whom it was communicated. It seems to have been the last attempt of Mr. Harris to influence the Empress by negotiation or bribery; and when Mr. Fox, for whom she entertained a great admiration, became Prime Minister, and the hostile policy of Lord North toward the American colonies was succeeded by one friendly and conciliatory, Mr. Harris found that he was treated with greater kindness than formerly by the Empress, whose sympathies were with the Americans, and with the new administration which favored their independence. It was soon after his failures in these not very creditable efforts in diplomacy that Mr. Harris requested to be recalled, and in this connection his grandson with great simplicity records in the diary:

"The evident hopelessness of obtaining an effective alliance with Russia, and the corrupt transactions in which Sir James Harris

was unavoidably involved at this court, where honesty, truth, and decency were openly disregarded, had completely disgusted him with his office."

It would seem that honesty, truth, and decency were there too highly regarded to suit the purposes of this Minister or his Government; and these qualities, notwithstanding the misrepresentations of British diplomatists and historians, and the slanders of the English press, have been substantially exemplified in the relations of Russia with other nations from that period until the present. I shall here, perhaps, be met with the vulgar cry of the partition of Poland, which occurred about a century ago, and has, with an industry and mendacity unparalleled in history, been so generally attributed to Russian intrigue and wickedness that, with few exceptions, the English-speaking race believe that Russia is alone responsible for what has been denounced as the most atrocious robbery of national life recorded in the annals of mankind. This has been taught in the common schools of our country, declaimed in lecture-rooms, elaborated by the novelist in many dramatic forms, and solemnly taught in churches, until the very mention of Poland suggests a once grand republic, peopled by a noble, liberty-loving, patriotic race, blotted out of the firmament of nations by the cruelty, ambition, and greed of a Russian despot. No picture of the past more false and unreal than this was ever presented.

The partition was first projected by the King of Prussia, who had long wished to acquire Polish or western Prussia, which lay between his German dominions and eastern Prussia, and hence at the will of the Poles cut off all communication between these portions of his kingdom. In 1769, while Poland was torn by civil commotions and desolated by the plague, under pretense of forming lines to prevent its spread, he occupied the whole of Polish Prussia with his troops. He knew that to hold this territory he must have the consent of Russia and Austria, and this led him to plan the partition of Poland among the three powers. He in 1769 or 1770 secured the ready concurrence of Austria, but found the Empress Catharine indisposed to agree to it. She was then engaged in a war with the Turks, and to secure her acquiescence the King sent his brother to St. Petersburg, who informed the Empress that Austria was forming an alliance with the Porte, which, should it take place, would create a most formidable combination against her, but that the friendship of the Emperor could be secured by assenting to the partition, upon which condition he would renounce his con-

nection with the Turk, and suffer the Russians to prosecute the war against him without interruption. Catharine, dreading the interference of the Emperor, and perceiving from the close relations existing between the Courts of Austria and Berlin that it would not be in her power to prevent the intended partition, assented to it, and the treaty for that purpose was executed by the three powers in February, 1772.

I have taken this account of the circumstances under which the partition was projected and planned, and the threat under which the assent of Catharine was obtained, from authentic English sources, which in the same connection assert that the British Government remonstrated against it. This is utterly untrue. When the representatives of the three powers informed that Government of the purpose to dismember Poland, the answer of the Earl of Suffolk, in the name of the King of Great Britain, was:

"The King may well suppose that the three powers are convinced of the justice of their respective pretensions, though his Majesty is not informed of the motives of their conduct."

This answer conveyed acquiescence, not remonstrance or protest; and, indeed, as will be presently shown from reliable sources, the nature of the case demanded neither, for, of all the accursed governments that ever existed on earth, that of Poland, from 1572 to 1772, was the worst, the most intolerable and oppressive: and this was so well known at the latter period throughout Europe that every just and humane ruler felt that any change of government must be a relief, to the wretched slaves who constituted the bulk of the Polish population, from the cruel and irresponsible rule of the nobles. I have space for but a few facts in justification of this statement, and these I shall take from impartial and reliable sources.

At the death, in 1572, of Sigismund Augustus, the last of the race of hereditary Polish kings, the nobles—between one hundred and fifty and two hundred thousand in number—formed a constitution, exclusively for their own benefit, which did not even notice the existence of the great mass of the miserable people who were slaves, in which it was provided that the nobles should pay no taxes, should have power of life and death over their vassals, should hold all offices—civil, military, and ecclesiastical—and in choosing their King should lay him under any restrictions they pleased. His election by this vast mass of electors was in the open field where they assembled armed, and here for two hundred years—from 1572 until the partition—they met ready to sell themselves to the high-

est bidder at the Court of Austria, France, Saxony, Sweden, or Brandenburg, and, as may be supposed, during that entire period one universal scene of corruption, faction, and confusion reigned—so that, as was said by a celebrated historian, "A Polish royal election was nothing more than a double auction of the throne." Almost every election was the signal for a civil war, usually lasting during the greater portion of the next reign, so that for the entire period of two hundred years, from the first election to the partition, Poland was the "constant scene of anarchy, and its attendant miseries—fire, bloodshed, and famine." And, as has been said by an able and eloquent English writer, Mr. Cobden: "There is nothing in the history of the world comparable for confusion, suffering, and wickedness, to the condition of this unhappy kingdom during these two centuries. . . . It was a despotism one hundred thousand times worse than that of Turkey, because it gave to one hundred thousand tyrants absolute power over the lives of the rest of the community. The annals of republican Poland, previously to its dismemberment, are nothing but a history of anarchy."

The historian who recounts the miseries showered upon the millions of slaves during this career of sacrilege and rapine—for religious fanaticism armed itself with torture and the sword—exclaims, "Oh that some strong despot would come and in mercy rescue these people from themselves!"

The wise reform, says an able historian, Herren, "that gave to Russia, at the hands of Peter the Great, the seeds of a power which has since grown to such greatness, and which, if adopted by Poland, would have, in all probability, conducted her to a similar state of prosperity, were absolutely rejected by the profligate nobles, because they must necessarily have involved some amelioration of the fate of the people."

What the partition has accomplished for that portion of Poland which came under the rule of Russia may be stated in the language of Mr. Cobden, an eminent liberal, who will certainly not be accused of an undue partiality toward a despotic government:

"Slavery," says he, "no more exists in Poland; the peasant that tills the soil no longer ranks on a level with the oxen that draw his plow; he can neither be murdered nor maimed at the caprice of an insolent owner, but is as safe in life and limb under the present laws of Poland as are the laborers of Sussex or Kent. The modern husbandman is not restricted to mere personal freedom; he enjoys the right to possess property of all kinds—not even ex-

cepting land—against which the nobles of ancient *republican* Poland opposed insuperable prohibitions. In a word, the peasantry of Poland now possess the control over their own persons and fortunes, and are at liberty to pursue happiness according to their own free will and pleasure."

Referring to the "Cabinet Cyclopædia—History of Poland"—a faithful compendium, we find that after the partition Russian Poland "had continued to improve beyond all precedent; at no former period of her history was the public wealth so great or so generally diffused: bridges and public roads constructed at an enormous expense—frequently at the cost of the Czar's treasury; the multitude of new habitations remarkable for a neatness and a regard to domestic comfort never before observed; the embellishments introduced into the buildings not merely of the rich but of the tradesmen and mechanics; the encouragement afforded and eagerly afforded by the Government to every useful branch of industry; the progress made by agriculture, in particular the foundation of Polish prosperity; the accumulation on all sides of national and individual wealth; and, above all, the happy countenances of the inferior classes of society—exhibited a wonderful contrast to what had lately been. The most immense of markets, Russia—a market all but closed to the rest of Europe—afforded constant activity to the manufacturer. To prove this astonishing progress from deplorable, hopeless poverty to successful enterprise, let one fact suffice. In 1815 there were scarcely one hundred looms for coarse woolen cloths; at the commencement of the insurrection of 1830 there were six thousand."

That insurrection, instigated by the nobles for the purpose of regaining control over the nation they had so long oppressed, was put down by Russia, and in the order issued to the troops to quell it they were required, under severe penalties, to respect the houses and property of the Polish peasants.

I have shown upon the best authority that the partition of Poland was not conceived or planned by Russia; that she was induced to engage in it under the threat and belief that, if she did not, Austria would join her ancient foe, Turkey, in making war upon her people; that, at the time of the transaction, Great Britain officially declared to the world that it might well be supposed the three partitioning powers were convinced of the justice of their respective pretensions; and it also appears that the people of that portion of Poland transferred to Russia have been vastly benefited by her rule. In view

of this, is it not time that the virtuous indignation hurled against Russia by the ignorant, the prejudiced, and the malicious, for her participation in that transaction, should cease? Should any one call in question the facts I have stated in her justification, they will be sustained by authorities which the ignorant and the prejudiced rarely consult, but which even the malicious will hardly venture to deny.

At a subsequent time I may take occasion to present somewhat in detail the actual condition of the Russian people since the emancipation of the serfs, together with some account of their institutions and laws. It is hardly necessary to say, however, that a government which has shown so deep and so abiding an interest in the Christian populations of other lands would not fail to manifest the utmost solicitude for the welfare of its own people; nor need I suggest that a sovereign, under whose direction a representative government was established upon the borders of his empire, in Bulgaria, before his troops ceased to occupy that country, is quite certain not only to be favorable to such an institution at home, but to adopt it so soon as his people are fit to choose their representatives. He is kind, wise, brave, and humane; beloved by his people, who are contented with a rule which has given them freedom, the ownership of the land they but a short time since cultivated as serfs, with the solid promise of a future marked by constantly increasing education and national prosperity.

I venture to close with the suggestion that, if we thoroughly study the history of the Russian Empire for the last hundred years, and compare it with that of any other European power, we shall find that its Government has surpassed all others in the sacrifices it has made in men and treasure to aid oppressed Christian nationalities in freeing themselves from tyranny and bondage; and, if we consider the conduct of the great Empress in our struggle for independence, and the sympathy shown us by her imperial descendant in our late struggle to hold the heritage received from our fathers, we must conclude that Russian sympathy is earnest and heart-felt, and not the mere offspring of Russian interests.

E. W. Stoughton.

DIVORCES IN NEW ENGLAND.

AGAINST divorce Romulus enacted severe laws which for a long time were rigidly observed. Spurius Camilius Ruga was the first person who obtained a formal divorce at Rome. This he did in the five hundred and twentieth year of the city. It is reported that, "such was the popular indignation attending the event, all Rome followed the divorcer till the end of his days." But this moral "indignation" did not always continue. Such were the extravagant modes of living, so corrupting were certain habits in society, and so prevalent the more secret vices in domestic life, that divorces became common. By means of these and other evils, the family as an institution declined, and then the Roman Empire, hoary with disease rather than age, tottered and fell.

It is only two hundred and sixty years since the settlement of New England, and some of the evils that caused the downfall of Rome are here too prevalent, and are assuming, to say the least, a threatening aspect. Among these evils is that of divorce, which has within a short period alarmingly increased. Prior to 1840 very few divorces were either sought or obtained, and these were confined almost wholly to one cause, viz., adultery. So few were the cases, and so scattered are the reports of them, that it is impossible to present anything like accurate statistics on the subject. Soon after 1840 the divorce laws were remodeled in several States, and the causes for divorce were increased from time to time, so that they could more easily be procured.

For obtaining statistics on divorces, no reliance can be placed upon the census, taken once in five or ten years. The census reports simply the number of divorced persons, male and female, found in a place at the time, without including the divorced persons who had died, moved away, or married again between these years. Parties who have been divorced, and their friends, fre-

quently take special pains to conceal the fact. Besides, it has been the practice of the courts to try these cases in private, and no public announcement is made of the results. It would seem, moreover, that, for many years, in providing reports of various changes or events in social life, as well as in publishing the proceedings of the courts, this matter of divorce was regarded either of little consequence, or was intended to be kept private. Divorce cases were tried in small numbers, at different times and places, and before different judges, so that the reports of them are widely scattered in court records.

The most appropriate place for such statistics is the Registration Bureaus, which collect the number of births, marriages, and deaths in the several States. But, unfortunately, neither Maine nor New Hampshire has ever established such a bureau. The only report of births, marriages, and deaths in these States is made to the authorities of towns and cities in which they occurred, for purposes of local interest and reference. Unless these important facts can be collected and tabulated on a large scale, the public can derive very little benefit from them for purposes of health, sanitary improvement, and social reform.

It is about forty years since the subject of establishing Registration Bureaus of births, marriages, and deaths began to be agitated in this country. The first report in Massachusetts was made in 1843; the first in Connecticut in 1849; in Rhode Island in 1853; and in Vermont in 1857. In reporting the number of births from year to year, it was quite natural to notice the number of deaths and their causes, showing what became of human life; but, in reporting the marriages, it did not seem to occur to legislators or statisticians that these could terminate in any other way than by the death of the parties.

For many years no provision was made by law for a report on divorces. Possibly the number of divorces was so small at the time that the need of reporting them was not felt by the projectors or compilers of registration; but it was not long before it was found necessary in some of the States to take cognizance of the number and causes of divorce. However, in the oldest and the most complete registration reports—those of Massachusetts—no mention whatever is made of divorces. The saddest fact in vital statistics is entirely ignored in these thirty-seven reports. The marriages since 1860—amounting to over two hundred and fifty thousand—are fully reported. But the statistics on divorce we are

able to present from another source;* and, as divorces were not very numerous in any of the States prior to 1860, we commence our tables with that year:

Massachusetts.

YEARS.	Divorces.	Marriages.	Ratio of D. to M.	YEARS.	Divorces.	Marriages.	Ratio of D. to M.
1860	243	12,404	1 to 51·0	1870	379	14,721	1 to 38·8
1861	234	10,972	1 " 46·8	1871	325	15,746	1 " 48·4
1862	196	11,014	1 " 56·2	1872	343	16,142	1 " 47·1
1863	207	10,873	1 " 52·5	1873	449	16,437	1 " 36·6
1864	270	12,513	1 " 46·5	1874	647	15,064	1 " 24·1
1865	333	13,051	1 " 39·2	1875	577	13,663	1 " 23·6
1866	392	14,428	1 " 36·8	1876	525	12,749	1 " 24·2
1867	282	14,451	1 " 51·2	1877	553	12,758	1 " 23·1
1868	339	13,853	1 " 40·8	1878	600	12,893	1 " 21·4
1869	339	14,826	1 " 43·7		7,233	2585,50	

Vermont.

YEARS.	Divorces.	Marriages.	Ratio of D. to M.	YEARS.	Divorces.	Marriages.	Ratio of D. to M.
1860	95	2,179	1 to 22·9	1870	164	2,928	1 to 18·4
1861	66	2,188	1 " 33·1	1871	203	2,742	1 " 13·5
1862	94	1,962	1 " 20·8	1872	146	2,749	1 " 18·8
1863	102	2,007	1 " 18·6	1873	175	2,714	1 " 15·4
1864	98	1,804	1 " 18·4	1874	170	2,724	1 " 15·9
1865	122	2,569	1 " 21·0	1875	171	2,709	1 " 15·8
1866	155	3,001	1 " 19·3	1876	168	2,642	1 " 15·7
1867	159	2,857	1 " 17·9	1877	175	2,615	1 " 15·0
1868	167	2,961	1 " 17·7	1878	197	2,766	1 " 14·0
1869	148	2,621	1 " 17·7		2,775	48,858	

Connecticut.

YEARS.	Divorces.	Marriages.	Ratio of D. to M.	YEARS.	Divorces.	Marriages.	Ratio of D. to M.
1860	282	3,978	1 to 14·1	1870	408	4,871	1 to 11·6
1861	275	3,757	1 " 13·6	1871	409	4,882	1 " 11·9
1862	257	3,701	1 " 14·4	1872	464	5,023	1 " 10·8
1863	291	3,467	1 " 11·9	1873	457	4,841	1 " 10·5
1864	426	4,107	1 " 9·6	1874	492	4,694	1 " 9·5
1865	404	4,460	1 " 11·1	1875	476	4,385	1 " 9·2
1866	488	4,798	1 " 9·8	1876	396	4,320	1 " 10·9
1867	459	4,779	1 " 10·4	1877	427	4,319	1 " 10·1
1868	478	4,734	1 " 9·9	1878	401	4,285	1 " 10·6
1869	491	4,754	1 " 9·6		7,781	84,153	

* In 1879 Hon. Carroll D. Wright, who has charge of the Bureau of Statistics of Labor for Massachusetts, caused the records of the Supreme Court to be carefully examined with reference to divorces, and, as a result, a valuable paper on the subject is presented in his last report (1880), giving the number of divorces, together with their causes, in Massachusetts, from 1860 to 1878.

Rhode Island.

YEARS.	Divorces.	Marriages.	Ratio of D. to M.	YEARS.	Divorces.	Marriages.	Ratio of D. to M.
1869	162	2,289	1 to 14·1	1874	242	2,541	1 to 10·5
1870	200	2,362	1 " 11·8	1875	158	2,485	1 " 15·7
1871	161	2,336	1 " 14·5	1876	196	2,253	1 " 11·5
1872	200	2,537	1 " 12·7	1877	178	2,282	1 " 12·8
1873	173	2,630	1 " 15·2	1878	196	2,324	1 " 11·8

There was no law in Rhode Island requiring a report of divorces to the registration office until 1869, so that the table here presented covers only ten years. The figures in each of these tables are believed to be correct, having been collected from official documents. No statistics can well be presented from Maine or New Hampshire. In both these States the marriages are recorded only in the records of the cities and towns where they occur, and the divorces only in the district records of the Supreme Court. It is well known that the laws on divorce there are liberal—the causes allowed numerous, and divorces are of frequent occurrence, probably as much so as in the other New England States. Estimates of the number of divorces in each of those States, based upon population, may be made with a good degree of accuracy. A careful inspection of the above tables suggests points of special interest. The reports here presented, instead of being exaggerated, come short of the truth. It is a well-known fact that many persons go from New England to the West to obtain divorces, because the laws in most of the Western States are more favorable to their designs. On the other hand, few come from other States into New England for this purpose ; though it is reported that there are persons removing from one New England State into another, where divorces may be more easily obtained. It is claimed that this has somewhat increased divorces in Connecticut and Rhode Island.

In examining these tables, it should be kept in mind that the figures do not show how many apply for divorce without obtaining it. The records of the courts, in some of the States, show that full one quarter of the persons applying for divorce fail for various reasons. Also, we have no account of the large number who consult attorneys for this purpose, without having their cases taken up at all, or, if commenced, the cases fail to reach a trial. Also, it is well known that there are, in almost every community, separations of husband and wife, who seldom if ever come together again.

In an examination of the above tables two things are obvious.

First, the steady increase of divorces in each State since 1860; and, second, the remarkable uniformity of this increase. If five years are taken at the commencement and close of each table, it makes a fairer comparison than one year. In Vermont, the first five years average 1 to 22·7; the last five, 1 to 15·2; in Connecticut, the first five, 1 to 13; the last five, 1 to 10·1; in Massachusetts, the first five, 1 to 50·6; the last five, 1 to 23·2; and in Rhode Island, the first five, 1 to 13·6; the last five, 1 to 12·5.* Thus, in Vermont and Connecticut, the increase has been nearly one third; in Massachusetts, the increase has more than doubled; while in Rhode Island the increase has been less than in either of the States.

Another point in the tables is obvious—the number of divorces varies much in different years. This is accounted for in part by a change in the laws. By the adoption of a new law, making divorce more easy, the increase is at once seen; and so the reverse, where a more stringent law is passed. It is said, moreover, that applications sometimes accumulate in the courts, so that when a judge has more time to attend to them or is more liberal in granting divorces, the cases are pushed for a trial, and thus a much larger number of decisions are obtained at one time than at another. The judges hold no special courts for trying divorce cases, but attend to them generally between sessions or at the close of court, as may be most convenient, so that the results will vary in different years.

The ratio of divorce to marriage would seem to be a more proper test, for discussing its merits and influence, than its relation to family or population. The term family is used sometimes in a general or vague sense. In taking the census or reporting the number of families residing in a place, it may mean a household or a few persons living together, constituting in either case a family. The individuals forming a family may be married or may be single.

The term population applies to people of all ages. In some communities, the proportion of aged persons may be very large, and in others that of children. In comparing the number of marriages in different communities or places, the proportion of young persons of a marriageable age in each should correspond; otherwise the comparison is not fair. But, even when this proportion exists,

* These figures do not represent correctly the ratio of divorces in these States, as will be seen by explanations upon another page. The Catholic marriages should be first deducted in each State. The true ratio of divorces to marriages stands thus (omitting fractions): In Massachusetts, one to fifteen; in Rhode Island, one to nine; in Connecticut, one to eight; and in Vermont, one to thirteen.

the comparison sometimes fails. If we take two communities, composed of an equal number of young people of a marriageable age, there may not be the same disposition to marry, arising from different tastes, standards of living, views of life, or some other cause. Thus in a Canadian-French, an Irish, or German population of young people, we find relatively a far greater number of marriages than among the same class of native New-Englanders. It is well known too that the state of business—that is, the times whether prosperous or hard—affects, among all classes, more or less, the number of marriages.

A brief notice of the progress and changes of legislation bearing on divorce seems here pertinent. Prior to 1840 the laws on this subject in the New England States were few and simple, and these remained comparatively a dead letter on the statute-book for more than half a century. Occasionally divorces were granted upon the ground of adultery and desertion, which were almost the only causes allowed. In 1843 legislation in Connecticut was changed, adding two causes, "habitual intemperance" and "intolerable cruelty." In 1849 the following causes for divorce were allowed in the same State: "imprisonment for life, or infamous crime," and any "such misconduct as permanently destroys the happiness of the petitioner and defeats the purposes of the marriage relation."

The changes in legislation in Vermont did not commence so early, and, as a whole, have not been so favorable to divorces. The principal causes allowed are adultery, desertion, cruelty, and refusal to support, while intemperance and misconduct, upon which a large number of divorces in Connecticut have been granted, are not recognized.

In Massachusetts changes in legislation favoring divorce were later still. The most important commenced in 1860 and 1867, and 1873 and 1874. The law allows eight distinct causes, and the number of divorces granted occur in the following order: desertion, adultery, intoxication, cruelty, abusive treatment, neglect to support, imprisonment, and impotency.

The changes in legislation, and causes allowed for divorce, in Rhode Island, are similar to those in Massachusetts.

The whole course of legislation in these States for thirty or forty years has been to open the door wider and wider for divorces, by multiplying the causes and removing restrictions. In only two instances has legislation attempted to check divorces. It being found in Connecticut that the clause in the bill passed in 1849,

specifying any "misconduct" interfering seriously with the marital relation, was used as a most effective agency for procuring divorce, this clause was repealed in 1878. In Vermont, it was found that parties obtaining a divorce married again immediately. This seemed to be a primary object; parties also moved into Vermont from other States to obtain a divorce. The Legislature in 1878 enacted a law that no outside parties could thus obtain a divorce, and that the party divorced—against whom the charges were proved—should not marry under three years, but the libellant—the innocent party—might marry at any time.

Though there is much similarity in the specified causes for divorce, in all the States, there is a difference in the conditions attached to these causes: for illustration, whether the desertion has been three, five, or seven years, and whether the intemperance existed before or commenced after marriage. It is well understood, also, that the causes alleged are not always the *real* causes. Married parties finding incompatibilities or disagreements of any kind to exist, or thinking a union with some other party would be productive of more pleasure, soon look about to see what provisions the law makes, whereby a separation may be effected. Of course, they select those provisions in the law which apply most conveniently to their own case, and can be used to the best advantage. In the applications for divorce, several causes are frequently alleged. The parties do not expect to prove all of them, but, by representing them to the court, they serve to strengthen the case, and show the infelicities of the petitioner in that the purposes of marriage are defeated. Whenever one party is determined on separation, and understands the law in such cases, it is not difficult to originate causes, and is certainly easy to aggravate them. Supposing both parties are intent upon separation, they are quite willing to use the means. Perhaps one will force or tempt the other to commit some crime or misdeed—the proof of which is not denied or objected to. Thus the object sought is readily obtained. It is well understood that such cases are not infrequent.

While the alleged causes for divorce in the several States are similar, there is a difference in the extent to which they prevail. In Massachusetts, of 7,233 divorces, between the years 1860 and 1878, the following report is given as the causes: Desertion, 3,013; adultery, 2,949; intoxication, 452; extreme cruelty, 375; abusive treatment, 223; neglect to support, 154; imprisonment, 50; and impotence, 17. Here the proportion of cases of adultery is larger

than in the other States, and that of intemperance and cruelty less. It is found that adultery generally prevails to a larger extent in cities than in the country. In Vermont the cases of adultery range less than one quarter, and those of cruelty more than a quarter. In Connecticut and Rhode Island adultery constitutes about one third of the cases.

The following report is given of 2,200 cases in Vermont: Adultery, 518; desertion, 382; cruelty, 592; neglect to support, 110; willful desertion, 348; crime, 10; insanity, 5; and bigamy, 4. The two last-named causes we do not find reported in any other State. Desertion in the two forms makes more than one third of all the cases in Vermont.

The number and causes of divorce vary greatly in different localities, especially between a city and country population. It is found that adultery and desertion as causes prevail far more extensively in cities than in rural districts, and also that the number of divorces in proportion to marriages is much larger in cities. As illustrations, take Boston and Providence: the ratio of divorce is twice as large as in many of the country towns in those States. If the Catholic marriages, which compose nearly one half in those cities, should be deducted, the ratio of divorces to marriages would be, to say the least, startling.

Who petitions, or brings the charges; is it the wife or husband? From an examination of the reports, it is found that the husband is the complainant in about one third of the cases, and the wife in two thirds; and the proportion in which she is the petitioner has been steadily increasing. It is not difficult to account in part for this disparity. The man can move away more readily or emigrate, but the woman is more confined and dependent. In the matter of desertion, cruel treatment, intoxication, adultery, and neglect to support, the man in a majority of cases is the guilty party. This fact is strikingly illustrated in the summary of causes for divorce in Massachusetts. In 7,233 divorces in this State, the report states that for adultery the husband obtained it against the wife in 1,295 instances, and the wife against the husband in 1,654 instances; for desertion, the husband in 1,063, and the wife in 1,950; for intoxication, the husband in 35, and the wife in 417; for extreme cruelty, the wife in 375; for abusive and cruel treatment, the wife in 223; for neglect to support, 154; for imprisonment, the husband in one instance, and the wife in 49; for impotency, the husband in 6 instances, and the wife in 11. It appears that under three heads

—cruelty, abusive treatment, and neglect to support—there was not a single case reported where the husband obtained a divorce on these charges.

How long do the divorced parties, on an average, live together? It is the testimony of attorneys managing such cases that complaints are frequently made soon after marriage, though it may require years before they are brought into court. In some instances, married parties have been grossly deceived in respect to each other's circumstances or characters, which do not always require a long time for exposure. From extended inquiries on the subject, we believe more than one half the divorces are obtained within eight or ten years after marriage. When parties have lived together fifteen or twenty years, divorces are not so common, and occur only occasionally after a longer period. In the great majority of cases there are no children or only one or two in the family.

The modes of trying divorces are similar in all the States. The Judges of the Supreme Court are constituted a tribunal for this purpose. The cases are usually tried in private, and generally the side of the petitioner only is heard. The law requires that notice should be sent to the defendant, who seldom if ever attends, so that there are no witnesses or cross-examination. Occasionally, when there is property, and alimony is demanded, or where there are children to which the parties are attached, such cases are contested, frequently with great interest and ability. As no provision is made for the court to sit expressly for hearing divorce cases, the petitioners are obliged to catch the opportunity between sessions or at their close. Nearly unlimited power is committed to the judges; more so than in almost any other suits. Not only the best interests of the contending parties are involved in the issue, but the highest welfare of the community and the State.

From what classes in society do divorces come? Do they come from the lower classes, or from all classes of the community? Once they were thought to be confined principally to the more vicious, and it was seldom that a case occurred in the higher walks of life. Formerly, too, there existed in the public mind a strong sentiment of indignation against divorces, and all the better classes were not slow to express a marked disapprobation of them. But the sentiments of the people have changed; divorces have become more common, and no class in society is exempt from them. They are certainly not confined to the ignorant or vicious, to the high or low, to the rich or poor. If any portion in the commu-

nity is more exempt than another, it is that class connected with Christian churches who regard marriage and the family as divine institutions, and endeavor to perform the duties growing out of them in a faithful and conscientious manner.

This leads us to notice a very large religious denomination which regards marriage as a "*sacrament*," and claims that its whole conduct should be regulated by the Church.

From the tables reporting the number of marriages in the several States, a large deduction must be made, in order to get the true ratio of marriages to divorces. It is well known that the Catholic denomination denies the validity of all divorces obtained by process of the courts, and it is quite certain that, in the divorces reported in these tables, not one can be counted as coming from the marriages performed by the Catholic priests. Marriage is considered by them as a *sacrament*, and its bonds can be severed only by order of the Church.

It is a rule of this body that all marriages performed by the priests must be reported to the bishops of the diocese in which they occur. In this way a full and correct record of all such marriages is preserved for reference. We have been kindly favored with a report of the number of these marriages for a series of years from official sources.* In the Registration Reports of all the States, the Catholic marriages are returned the same as others, and the ratio of divorce presented in these tables is based upon all alike. But this is not fair or correct. These marriages should, in every case, be exempt. This will make quite a difference in the result.

In Massachusetts the Catholic marriages amount every year to about one third of the whole; in Rhode Island, more than one fourth; in Connecticut, one fourth; and in Vermont, one eighth. This deduction will increase, in the same proportion in each State, the ratio of divorce to marriage.

We present this ratio from two points of view: first, for one year, 1878; and, second, for the last five years reported in these tables: The Catholic marriages in Massachusetts, for 1878, were 3,978; in Connecticut, the same year, 1,019; in Rhode Island, 646; and in Vermont, 325. After deducting these marriages, the ratio of divorce stands thus: 1878, in Massachusetts, 1 to 14·8; in Rhode

* For these returns we would express our obligations to Archbishop Williams, of Boston; Bishop O'Reilly, of Springfield; Bishop Hendrickson, Providence; Bishop McMahon, Hartford; and Bishop L. De Goesbriand, Burlington, Vermont.

Island, 1 to 8·5 ; in Connecticut, 1 to 8·1 ; and in Vermont, 1 to 12·4. The average ratio for the years 1874–'78 is as follows : In Massachusetts, 1 to 15·5 ; in Rhode Island, 1 to 9 ; in Connecticut, 1 to 7·6 ; and in Vermont, 1 to 13·7.

The ratio of divorces to marriages for a series of years in those States may be safely stated (omitting fractions) as follows : In Massachusetts, 1 to 15 ; in Rhode Island, 1 to 9 ; in Connecticut, 1 to 8 ; and in Vermont, 1 to 13. Statistics show that divorces in cities are more numerous than in the country. The census shows that cities also contain relatively a much larger foreign population. It is found that the Catholic marriages in many cities range from one third to one half of the whole, which, in order to obtain correctly the ratio of divorce, must be deducted.

The report of the Bureau of Statistics of Labor for Massachusetts, in 1878, gives the ratio of divorce in the whole State as 1 to 21·4, but in Boston 1 to 19·6. If we deduct the Catholic marriages in Boston, the ratio of divorce must be about 1 to 12. In Rhode Island, the ratio of divorce is 1 to 9 for the whole State, but for Providence it must be about 1 to 8. The same remark may apply to New Haven, as well as to all cities containing a large foreign population. In all cases, whether in the city or country, in order to obtain correctly this ratio of divorce, the Catholic marriages must first be deducted.

The changes in the laws, which have resulted in so many divorces, have all been made within thirty or forty years, and most of them within half that time. They have been made at several different times in each State, thus supplying new causes or conditions whereby divorces could be more easily obtained. This new legislation was undoubtedly intended, in each instance, to meet a particular class of cases, and the agents in securing this change of the law were generally parties seeking a divorce, or their friends or attorneys.

All persons who have had any experience in such matters, and know the peculiar arts or means employed to influence legislators, understand at once how easy it is to effect a change in the laws, especially on subjects where the particular points and the effects of such changes are not understood or well considered. Thus, in extending and liberalizing the divorce laws, the designs of individuals and the effect of such changes upon society have not always been taken into account. This legislation applies also to exceptional cases, where an individual here and there may be relieved. But

large numbers avail themselves of the provisions of the law for purely selfish purposes.

Whenever a person is governed by selfish motives, he is not scrupulous as to the means employed for the accomplishment of his purposes. In such a line of conduct naturally follow "desertion," "acts of cruelty," "neglect to support," etc., etc.; and a course of "misconduct" may be easily assumed, which will make the life of a partner miserable, and thus defeat the objects of matrimony.

Now, what is the effect of such legislation on marriage generally, and upon the family? Does it not tend to strip the former of its sanctity, and impair the permanence of the latter? Does it not, in fact, furnish inducements or a reward for misconduct and wrongdoing? With a knowledge of such legal provisions for divorce, how are persons affected in contemplating the marriage relation? Is it not calculated directly to lower the character of this relation, and endanger the perpetuity of the union?

What also is the effect of separation upon the divorced parties themselves? Does it always improve their habits or reform their character? The grossest charges may be proved against the husband or wife, showing an utter unfitness for such a relation, but either of them, as far as the law is concerned, can in a short time enter this same relation again. The law forbids bigamy and polygamy, but tolerates a succession of partners.

For the first two hundred years few divorces were sought or obtained in New England, and those mostly on the ground of adultery. Far greater sanctity was then attached to marriage. The moral and religious element entered largely into it, and the family institution was very generally regarded as of divine appointment. As changes in the laws occurred, and more liberal provisions were made for divorce, marriage has been regarded more as simply a civil contract. It is a kind of partnership, intended only for the convenience and interests of the parties concerned.

There are apparent reasons to believe that its sanctity and divine appointment have at the present day altogether too little influence. We think also that too low views prevail in reference to the character and permanence of the family. In the estimation of many this institution has no foundation in divine revelation, and there are no penalties attached to the laws growing out of the family ordinance.

In this state of things it may be well to inquire what are the

primary objects of marriage; what are the first principles or great laws upon which it is based? Two sources of information are open to us—one in the revealed will of God as found in the sacred Scriptures, and the other in those laws which are written upon man's physical organization. The latter, as we might suppose, form a complete counterpart of the former. The natural laws always harmonize perfectly with the revealed will of God, when both are correctly interpreted. This harmony affords the strongest possible evidence of their truth.

As marriage is the outward rite or sacred vestibule to the family, it is very important that correct views be entertained concerning it. If false or low sentiments govern parties here, corresponding views will prevail with reference to the character and permanence of the family relation. Marriage has two aspects, a *divine* and a *civil*, from both of which arise grave duties and responsibilities. In entering into this relation, therefore, these duties should be kept constantly in mind, otherwise the primary objects intended, or that should grow out of this relation in life, will entirely fail. That marriage and the family have their origin and foundation in revelation, require no argument. Hence there are a sacredness, a moral obligation, a divine appointment connected with this relation, which can not be trifled with or ignored with impunity. This higher view of marriage appeals to and has its groundwork in the moral and religious nature of man: unless motives emanating from this moral source have a leading and controlling influence, the relation itself is endangered. Those higher and more disinterested faculties of man can be fully and properly developed only as they are exercised in reference to the Creator of all things, as well as the moral Governor in human affairs. That marriage may secure its great primary objects, it is indispensable that those propensities or faculties which lie at the foundation of the family, such as the sexual relation, mutual attachment, love of offspring, etc., should be governed by the purest and noblest principles.

If these lower faculties are not controlled by the moral sentiments, they come directly under the influence of man's selfish nature. Hence the results of marriage depend very much upon the leading influences at its formation, and all the domestic relations of the family will be more or less affected from the same source. When individuals enter upon the marriage relation under a low range of motives and influences, they soon develop separate interests that grow wider and wider apart, resulting in an intense *individualism*,

which is nothing more nor less than supreme selfishness, and nothing short of a permanent separation will then satisfy them.

Let us refer to the history of the divorces already described, and the causes that led to them. How can we account for such changes in the marital relation, and for such strange developments of human conduct, unless there was something wrong in the motives or influences operating at the start? Passing by the most flagrant cause—adultery—how could "intolerable cruelty," "willful desertion," and "abusive treatment," occur in such a multitude of instances between married persons? How can we account for such dislike, such bitterness, and even hatred, between parties once apparently so tenderly and happily united? Such conduct is surely the farthest possible from anything of a moral and religious character. What a strange spectacle does it present in social life, that, within twenty years, more than twenty thousand divorces should have been granted in four New England States—that in this period the marital relations should be severed between forty thousand persons! In 1860 the number of divorces, in these same States, did not average seven hundred, but now it averages every year almost twice that number. If we include the divorces granted in Maine and New Hampshire with those in the other four States, it makes two thousand families broken up every year, and four thousand persons at the same time divorced. And it should be remembered that this destruction of the family does not apply to the foreign population, but is confined to the strictly native New-Englanders.

The value and permanence of the family as an institution can not be too highly estimated. It is indispensable to all organized society. It is the nursery of the Church, and no state or nation can prosper long without it. Wherever a people have attained the greatest prosperity, or advanced to the highest civilization, there the interests of the family have been most sacredly guarded. The experience of six thousand years, through changes numerous and varied, has demonstrated the superlative importance of the family institution. And the stronger the safeguards surrounding it, furnished by law and custom, the more permanent and successful will it be, and the greater the prosperity of any nation. Among no Christian or civilized people at the present day do we find divorces sought and obtained to such an extent as now in New England; and in only three instances in the history of nations can we find such a breaking up of the family by this means. The first indications of decline in Greece and Rome were disturbances in the family. When

the interests of this institution began to suffer in various ways, divorces multiplied, which with other evils brought on the downfall of those nations once so renowned.

In 1790, when the floodgates of the French Revolution were opened, the frequency of divorces became alarming. Within a year and a half more than twenty thousand divorces were granted; but even these, in proportion to the whole population of France at that time, are not equal to the ratio of divorces to marriages as now found in Rhode Island and Connecticut.

If there had been no accessions to our population from a foreign source, and the increase or changes had been confined exclusively to the native stock, we should probably witness an exhibition of facts very different from what exists at the present day. Could this foreign element be at once eliminated entirely, domestic life would present in New England a very different appearance. The real state of the family and its relations to the public might then be better understood. Without entering upon any detailed discussion of this subject, two or three points only will be noticed.

An inspection of the tables in the early part of this paper shows that the difference in the number of marriages in the four States, between 1860 and 1878, was quite small. In Massachusetts the increase of marriages of 1878 over those of 1860 (the whole number being over 12,000) was only 489, while the increase of population between these years amounted to 420,846. From the Registration Reports it appears that this addition of population is made up largely of the foreign element. It is evident, too, that this increase has gained more rapidly of late years than formerly. From the same reports it appears that the birth-rate of the foreign class is more than twice as large as the American, and the marriage-rate of the foreign is also considerably larger. It also appears that the birth-rate and the marriage-rate of the strictly American have, for a long time, been decreasing—so much so that the increase of numbers in this class is very small, and in some places even doubtful. From the same reports these two facts are gleaned: 1. In a much larger number of cases than formerly marriage is postponed to a later period in life; and, 2. A greater disparity of ages between the parties is found to exist than formerly. It may be that these general facts sustain a more intimate relation to the increased number of divorces than at first would be supposed.

What can be done to eradicate, or arrest the progress of evils which so direfully threaten the vital interests of society? May

there not be something wrong in the notions and views of marriage, as entertained at the present day? Has there not been a departure, in the teaching and practice, from what once prevailed in New England as to the objects of marriage? Have not the vital interests of the family, in too many cases, been undervalued or misunderstood? What, then, are the teachings of experience? What are the instructions on the subject as given by the oldest and largest Christian denominations in Europe?

The primary objects of marriage as indicated in works on the subject, in formulas of marriage service, in liturgies, and prayer-books, may be summed up under these three heads: 1. *The production of children;* 2. *The preservation of chastity;* and, 3. *Mutual company and help.* These propositions not only derive their support from the Scriptures, but are confirmed by all experience. They have also their counterpart in the laws of human organization. Independently of all evidence derived from the Scriptures, or even from experience, in favor of the family, we believe the necessity of such an institution, in order to promote the highest welfare of man, can be proved from physiology alone.

The primary objects of marriage as stated in these propositions can be secured only by a proper observance of the laws of this science. Moreover, the failure to comply with either one of these propositions goes so far toward weakening and breaking down the marriage relation. While the observance of the commands of Revelation on this subject is indispensable, the laws of physical organization are equally important. The teachings and instructions derived from the former source would have a far more powerful effect were their connection with the laws which govern the body to be more clearly and forcibly set forth. It would be seen that the penalties attached to the violation of physical laws are as sure and terrible as those attached to the violation of spiritual. In many cases the retributions are even more severe, and come much sooner. Besides, not only the violators of these laws, but their descendants, frequently suffer the penalties.

The science of physiology is comparatively in its infancy, as far as a practical application of its principles to the domestic relations of life is concerned. It might be shown that the propositions stated above as to the objects of marriage sustain a most intimate and important relation to this science. It might also be shown that its principles, practically applied, will shed light upon other dark spots or evils in domestic life, and afford a better ex-

planation of some of the causes which have led to so many divorces.

What can be done to check divorces, and place the domestic relations upon a more permanent foundation? The primary objects of marriage and the importance of the family institution must be better understood and appreciated. The public, and especially the young, need instruction upon this subject. Parents have here a sacred duty to perform to their children. The pulpit and the press should give more attention to it. By this, and other means, considerations of a high moral and religious character should be brought to bear upon it with all the appropriateness and power that is possible. The value of the family and the need of securing its health and permanence can not be too thoroughly impressed upon all classes.

As long as the interests of the family were made paramount, as long as a "home and the blessing of children were the end and essence of life" to the Roman citizen, Rome flourished. But when "marriage on both sides became a matter of mercantile speculation," and there was a "general unwillingness to rear families," arising from "an extravagantly high standard of comfort"—when infidelity in the domestic relations became a matter of frequent occurrence, and divorces multiplied—the Roman Empire perished.*

When an institution has such a forming and governing influence upon society and the state as the family, too great safeguards can not be thrown around it, both by law and custom. We should have wiser and more stringent legislation upon divorces. There is need of higher intelligence and greater watchfulness on the part of those who direct public opinion and make our laws. In addition to a more general diffusion of knowledge and improved legislation, those physical laws which lie at the foundation of all others must be recognized and obeyed. If false views prevail in the community as to the objects of marriage, and habits are indulged which violate physical laws, these views and habits must be corrected. Also, if changes are going on in the physical organization of our people which interfere seriously with the duties and responsibilities

* "Rome is a most interesting study for us Americans, because her vices, greed for gold, prodigality, a coarse material civilization, corruption in the family as manifested by connubial unfaithfulness, and divorces, are increasing among us. Whether we are to be a thoroughly Christian nation, or are destined to decay and loss of our present political forms, depends upon our ability to keep family life pure and simple." ("Essay on Divorce," p. 49, by T. D. Woolsey, D. D., LL. D.)

of domestic life, they should be thoroughly understood. If such an intense nervous temperament, with a lack of muscular power, is being developed as to beget both an indisposition and an inability to comply normally with the propositions laid down above as to marriage, it is wise to pause and consider. How can a people truly prosper and increase in numbers, while constantly violating great fundamental laws?

NATHAN ALLEN.

McCLELLAN'S LAST SERVICE TO THE REPUBLIC.

PART III.

THERE remains for us but one subject for discussion in connection with the historical events over which we have passed in the preceding papers. This relates to one of those popular errors which sometimes become so fixed as matters of belief that they seem to have passed into history as if they were not to be controverted. It has long been assumed by many persons that General McClellan's Harrison's Landing letter to Mr. Lincoln was intended as a political manifesto of his own. The popular shrewdness in making such imputations is always well satisfied with its own wisdom, however little of intellectual or moral penetration may be exercised in making them. And therefore, to present a plain view of a virtuous man, acting from motives in which self has no concern, often seems to be a useless appeal against that which has been popularly pronounced to be unquestionable. But the power to appreciate sincerity and elevation of character, the capacity to do justice upon facts, the disposition to believe in the existence of pure and disinterested aims, have not wholly fled even from the present age. It was, therefore, with entire confidence that we should not want an audience, and a very large one, that we undertook to give an account of some of the circumstances attending General McClellan's relations to the Administration of President Lincoln, and especially of the strange occurrence of his removal from command after the battle of Antietam. The approbation which we have received from many of the wise and good has fully justified and rewarded our labors.

The breaking out of our civil war found General McClellan in private life, and in a lucrative employment which he could not surrender without great sacrifices. It is no disparagement of the patriotism of any others of the distinguished soldiers of whatever

rank, on either side of that contest, to say that McClellan was actuated by a pure sense of duty, and not by political ambition, when he tendered his sword to the Government of the United States. He had been educated in its military service; and he had so learned of its political institutions that every conviction of his intellect and every feeling of his heart bound him to the preservation of the Union. He had had, at a very early age, great opportunities for acquiring military knowledge in the war with Mexico. He had been afterward sent, at the expense of the Government, while in the flower of his youth, to increase that knowledge by personal observation of one of the most gigantic wars of modern Europe. The facilities which he there enjoyed, along with colleagues who were much his seniors in age and military rank, had enabled him to accumulate a fund of professional information which was even more extensive than it could have been if he had held a command in either of the contending armies. In Mexico, under our own great captain, Scott, he had seen the teachings of his education confirmed—that war is a science. In the Crimea he had seen that science applied on the grandest scale, and in the most exact methods, by the armies of three nations. He had afterward been engaged in employments that gave him an uncommon familiarity with the geographical features, the resources, and the peculiarities of vast regions of our own country. So that, when our national conflict was culminating to a territorial civil war and a struggle for the supremacy of our national Constitution, he did not feel himself at liberty to withhold from the service of his country any part of that wealth of experience and knowledge which his country had enabled him to have. It was a simple case of paying back a debt; and, from the time when he undertook to discharge it to the moment when he was summarily retired into complete inactivity and intended disgrace, he never did an act, nor uttered a word, nor wrote a line that was not inspired by a sense of patriotic duty, or that any man can justly impute to a selfish motive.

Probably in all military history there is no sudden and unexplained removal of a commander, who was on the eve of a well-planned movement against the enemy, which furnishes a parallel to this case of General McClellan. Certainly there is none for which it is so difficult to assign a respectable motive. On the 7th of November, when McClellan is about to divide Lee's army, an order suddenly reaches him, requiring him to turn over the command to a general whom neither the army nor the public had rea-

son to regard, and who did not regard himself, as competent to the position, and to go into a disgraced retirement. So extraordinary an act demands investigation. It is one of the unsolved points in the history of the late war, on which the inquirer must enter with the expectation of finding either an adequate or an inadequate reason for the act.

We have for many years been seeking and digesting information on this subject, but, when we began to write upon it, the first thing that occurred to us was the necessity for knowing whether the subject of General McClellan's removal was laid by Mr. Lincoln before his Cabinet, at any time previous to the issuing of the order, and whether any and what determination was then announced by the President. In order to ascertain this we recently addressed a note to the only surviving member of Mr. Lincoln's Cabinet, and received from him the following reply :

WASHINGTON, *January* 21, 1880.

MY DEAR SIR: I have yours of the 19th, asking if the removal of McClellan from command was discussed in the Cabinet before the order was given, and in reply I have to inform you that it was. The meeting was attended by Halleck, and it was stated by him that the excuses given by McClellan for not moving were untrue. I recollect particularly that in reference to a supply, I think, of shoes, which General McClellan had written were indispensable and had not been received, Halleck undertook to show, by official statements of shipments made, that McClellan had not stated the truth.

I opposed the removal violently, upon the ground that Hooker, who was the person spoken of for the succession, was entirely incompetent for the position. Burnside's name was not mentioned, and I was utterly amazed when I saw it announced. I had to accept as true the statement that McClellan had been making unnecessary delay, although, as it turned out afterward, the charge was wholly unfounded. Governor Curtin was in McClellan's camp at the time, and afterward stated that it was true that McClellan had not the shoes required for his men to move.

Mr. Lincoln did not decide at that time to remove McClellan, but I saw that he was coming to that conclusion, and I went out to Silver Spring for my father to go that night to the Soldiers' Home, where Mr. Lincoln was then staying, to endeavor to prevent the removal. He accordingly went that night to see Mr. Lincoln, and spent a long time in arguing against the proposal, telling Lincoln that it would be both a military and political blunder for him to take that step; that the opposition to McClellan came from Chase and Stanton, who were hostile to him (Lincoln), and that the man whom they wanted to supersede McClellan with would be also adverse to him if he succeeded; and, if he failed, he (Lincoln), would have to bear the reproach of it.

Lincoln listened with attention to all my father had to say, but was not communicative himself. But at the end of the conference he rose up and stretched his long arms almost to the ceiling above him, saying: "I said I would remove him if he let Lee's army get away from him, and I must do so. He has got the 'slows,' Mr. Blair!"

It was manifest to me that there was something more than I knew of, of which McClellan's opponents were availing themselves against him. I had stood by McClellan as I did by Grant against the attempts made by Stanton and Chase, and other politicians, in their efforts to overslaugh them, without being in the confidence of either of these generals. I did not know till McClellan visited me, while attending the Porter trial the winter afterward, and read me his Harrison's Landing letter, what it was that made Lincoln so deaf to my own and my father's efforts. But, when McClellan read that letter, I told him at once that it was that letter which had enabled Stanton and Chase to remove him. It had been used to make Lincoln look upon him as a rival, and he had judged him from that point of view; and while I believed Lincoln to be as unselfish as any man, he was yet a man, and no man could be told day by day that another was making use of the place he gave him to supersede him in his own place, without being afterward against him and ready to believe that he was both unfriendly and unfit for his position.

Yours truly,

MONTGOMERY BLAIR.

GEORGE T. CURTIS, Esq., New York.

The Cabinet council to which Mr. Blair alludes was held on the 5th of November. The order requiring General McClellan to turn over the command to General Burnside was dated on the same day. No reason for it was ever assigned by the President to General McClellan or to the country. In the absence, therefore, of any avowed reason, coming from Mr. Lincoln himself, we are remitted to the inquiry, what relation the Harrison's Landing letter may have borne to the determination of the President to recall McClellan after the battle of Antietam, and to reduce him to a condition of entire inactivity. We must ask the reader to turn back to the letter, in our first article, and to note that it proposed to Mr. Lincoln a certain policy in the prosecution of the war, to be adopted and followed out by *him*, and from which, if any credit or benefit of a political nature was to accrue to any one, it would accrue to Mr. Lincoln. For it is not to be forgotten that this was a private letter. Its existence was not publicly known; and, if Mr. Lincoln had shown it to any persons in Washington, they had kept the secret well among themselves. This remained the condition of things, as to the letter, until long after McClellan's removal from the command. Our readers have seen that one very striking feature of the

policy which General McClellan suggested to Mr. Lincoln consisted in a mode in which the emancipation of slaves could be properly made to result from military measures and operations. It was not the same plan that Mr. Lincoln suddenly adopted nearly three months after he received General McClellan's letter, and five days after General McClellan had gained the battle of Antietam. General McClellan's plan proposed that the Government should permanently appropriate slave-property to its own use, recognizing the right of the owner to compensation—a principle which he suggested "might be extended, upon grounds of military necessity and security, to all the slaves in a particular State, thus working manumission in such State." Mr. Lincoln's subsequent plan attempted to abolish slavery by an executive decree, without recognizing any right to compensation. It is not necessary to consider here which of these two plans was the wisest, or the most practical. We are not dealing with the merits of either of them; but we are dealing with the historical fact that, in the month of July, 1862, General McClellan, in a private letter to Mr. Lincoln, proposed for his adoption a comprehensive policy in the prosecution of the war, one important part of which embraced a mode of effecting the extinguishment of slavery as a legitimate measure of war. While General McClellan remained at Harrison's Landing, and afterward, while he had as yet gained no striking successes excepting that he had saved the Army of the Potomac from destruction, after which he had been put into a kind of disgrace, his Harrison's Landing letter, still an entirely private document in the hands of Mr. Lincoln, could not have been regarded as a matter for any political anxiety. But when he had saved Washington from capture, and had defeated Lee at the battle of Antietam, if his letter, written three months previously, was suddenly recalled to the recollection of Mr. Lincoln and those of his Cabinet who had seen it, they must have especially remembered his suggestion of a plan for the manumission of slaves, as a measure of military operations and necessities.

We now come, therefore, to a theory which has been suggested to account for the removal of General McClellan from command after the battle of Antietam. This theory, when fully stated, is as follows: That, with this letter from General McClellan in his possession, Mr. Lincoln was persuaded to believe that, if the writer should succeed in destroying Lee's army, he would become a formidable rival for the next Presidency; that this letter would be McClellan's "platform"; that his platform must therefore be anti-

cipated by an Executive proclamation that slavery was to be exterminated by an Executive decree; that circumstances had compelled Mr. Lincoln, after Pope's defeat, to restore McClellan to command, and to permit him to free Maryland from the presence of the enemy; but that, when this had been done, it was politically necessary to prevent McClellan from becoming, by further successes, a competitor in the next Presidential election, and a competitor who would be able to show a prior claim to the policy of emancipation.

This theory derives some color from the fact that Mr. Lincoln suddenly changed his mind on the subject of emancipation. On the 13th of September he told a deputation of clergymen from Chicago that an emancipation proclamation would be no more effective than "the Pope's bull against the comet"; but on the 22d of September, after McClellan had gained the battle of Antietam, Mr. Lincoln issued a proclamation announcing that on the first of the succeeding January he should issue another abolishing slavery in every State that adhered to the rebellion. The theory or explanation of General McClellan's removal from the command of the army, at a moment when he was on the very eve of a great success, is that the Harrison's Landing letter was the moving cause. But, if this is a true explanation of General McClellan's removal, Mr. Lincoln made an enormous mistake in regard to the character and purpose of the Harrison's Landing letter, and the character and purpose of the writer. Through every line of that letter there breathes a manifest intention to present to Mr. Lincoln's mind a comprehensive policy in the prosecution of the war, which Mr. Lincoln was, if he should adopt it, to appropriate to himself ; which was to redound to Mr. Lincoln's benefit, so far as it could redound to the personal benefit of any one. There is not a word in the letter which can justify any one in believing that the writer was seeking to lay up political treasure for himself, in the archives of the Government, or in Mr. Lincoln's private repositories. Among gentlemen, it is usually considered an act of meanness to claim afterward the authorship of a paper which one has given to another who is in a high position of public trust, for adoption as a measure of public policy ; and no man, who ever knew General McClellan well, can believe that he deliberately planned to commit such an act of meanness. His letter was the letter of one gentleman to another. The writer, it is true, was a general in the service of the Government ; the recipient was the head of that Government. But the letter nevertheless was not an official letter ; it was a private letter, suggesting to Mr.

Lincoln's "private consideration" a certain line of policy for his adoption. Mr. Lincoln desired, when in June he assented to General McClellan's proposal to submit to him his views respecting the whole conduct of the war, that care should be taken to preserve secrecy. Such care was taken. General McClellan wrote the letter with his own hand in his tent at Harrison's Landing, and placed it himself in the hands of Mr. Lincoln. Mr. Lincoln need not have shown it to a human being. He might have propounded to his Cabinet the policy which it described, without saying that General McClellan had recommended it. Public men in such positions have often received the most important suggestions from some one else, and have not deemed themselves bound to disclose their authorship. If Mr. Lincoln had proposed this policy for the consideration of his Cabinet, without saying that it had been suggested by General McClellan, there can be no doubt that it would have had a fair consideration, and possibly it might have been adopted. If it had been, there can be as little doubt that the world never would have known from General McClellan that the suggestion came from him; while he would have been able to say that he concurred in what the President had determined on, and would do everything in his power as a general to carry it out.

General McClellan may well have been astonished, therefore, as we believe he was, when he heard it said, long after his removal from the command, that his private letter to Mr. Lincoln had caused the latter to regard him as having sought by means of it to set his sails for the popular breeze, and that out of his sails the wind had been taken by Mr. Lincoln's proclamation. If ever a man was intent upon anything that was unselfish, and devoid of any purpose but to serve his official superior, it was General McClellan when he sketched that great policy for Mr. Lincoln's private consideration. All that happened in the political world, two years afterward, when General McClellan, by no procurement of his own, was nominated as the Democratic candidate in the summer of 1864, has of course no relevancy to the cause or causes which operated upon Mr. Lincoln's mind in November, 1862, to make him recall General McClellan from the command of the Army of the Potomac, and to bid him report at Trenton, in the State of New Jersey.

Among the members of Mr. Lincoln's Cabinet in the summer and autumn of 1862, there were two persons who were as unfriendly to Mr. Lincoln as they were to General McClellan. Mr. Chase had reasons of his own for representing to Mr. Lincoln that the Demo-

crats then had General McClellan in training as their future candidate for the Presidency, although it would have been difficult for him to show in what the training consisted. Any one who remembers the condition of Democratic sentiment on the subject of slavery and the proper objects of the war, at the time when General McClellan wrote his letter to Mr. Lincoln, and even down to a much later period, can easily see that the letter never was designed by the writer as a means of recommending himself to that party as their candidate for the Presidency. But Mr. Chase—to borrow an old parliamentary phrase—"took nothing" by his efforts to undermine Mr. Lincoln's confidence in McClellan. He may be dismissed to the innumerable company of those who "filed their minds" and gained nothing by it for themselves. The one redeeming part of Mr. Chase's conduct toward McClellan is, that he never pretended to be anything but an enemy. But, in all that scene of infidelity to the military interests of the republic, there stands forth one central figure, prominent in double-dealing, celebrated for duplicity, the arch-hypocrite Stanton. The world does not now learn his amazing insincerity for the first time, or from us. Our proof of it is only cumulative. The character to which that proof relates is one that no man can explain, one that no party and no faction can bear to defend. This man began at an early period to fawn upon McClellan. It is not improbable that the young General, in the frankness of his own nature, and in his readiness to accept all proffered aid in the great public duties which devolved upon him after he became general-in-chief by the advice of General Scott, may have believed in the personal devotion and attachment which this eminent Pennsylvania lawyer professed to himself, to his relatives, and to his friends in the army. But, there was at first a jarring string in these strains of flattery. The part was overacted, although the actor did not, until he was warned, perceive wherein he "o'erstepped the modesty of nature." He thought to recommend himself to McClellan by the grossest ridicule and abuse of Lincoln. He found that McClellan's sense of propriety did not approve this coarse disparagement of his official superior. But, as Mr. Stanton was known to be a man of high ability and distinction in his profession, and as Mr. Lincoln was disposed to believe that he would be a valuable Secretary of War, both because of his energy and because of his avowed friendship for McClellan, the latter, when consulted, gave his influence with the President for the introduction of Mr. Stanton into the Cabinet.

There is a saying—"something musty"—about the displacement of ladders after an elevation has been reached. As time went on, as Mr. Stanton's ambition grew, and "his infant fortune came to age" with the increase of his power, he came to know how necessary McClellan was to Mr. Lincoln, and how important to the country it was that the best relations should exist between them. Knowing this, he determined that McClellan should be ruined. For Lincoln he had so much contempt that he thought he could be trusted to ruin himself. Yet to the last hour of his intercourse with McClellan, and down to the final consummation of his purpose, Mr. Stanton professed to McClellan and his friends an unalterable fidelity, and an unchangeable conviction of his importance to the public interests: while, at the very same time, the occasional ebullitions of his hostility, bursting forth from his arrogant temper, in the presence of others, and his official acts, betrayed the object to which his hatred was carrying him, long before it was finally attained. The army saw it, if the people of the Union did not. McClellan was to be destroyed by making Lincoln distrust him. The scheme succeeded—the deed was done. But what of the chief conspirator?

Dante, as he walks through the infernal realms, protected by the great Mantuan Spirit "whose fame still lasts in the world, and will last as long as time," tells us of the common herd, undistinguishable from one another, who are grouped in eternal suffering according to the nature of their besetting sin. These are they who are damned by classification. We do not learn their names or nations. We only see them, in crowds, in a situation of dreadful appropriateness to their peculiar transgression. But, when the poet encounters one of those historical personages on whom, because of the consequences which his acts have entailed upon his country or mankind, there should be fastened all the infamy that is his due, we have the individual and his history touched by the master's stroke, and the sufferer stands for ever alone in the awful characterization of his fate. One of these ghastly objects of retribution is that Bertran de Born who "gave the evil counsels" which separated those who should have been united. The spectacle of this false counselor to a prince, which the poet describes, is too horrible to be transferred in detail to these pages. But, if any one is disposed to wonder that this image has risen up before us as we write of a passage in our national annals, let him count, if he can, the soldiers' graves, the widows' and the orphans' tears, the treasure

needlessly squandered, the war needlessly prolonged, the whole vast sum of misery and sorrow which must be charged to the malice that one man bore to another. And, when he sickens in the contemplation of these accumulated woes, let him turn to the so-called historical literature of the country, and note how, from the same source, it has been poisoned with lies. We must thread this dreary maze of Stanton's treachery and Lincoln's weakness, until we have reached conclusions on which it is fit that a final judgment should rest.*

* An illustration of Mr. Stanton's character comes to us while we write. On the 3d of April, 1862, General Franklin received an order to embark his division for the Peninsula, to be under the command of General McClellan in the advance upon Richmond. Calling at the War Department on that evening, General Franklin met General McDowell. The following account is taken from the "Philadelphia Times" of April 28, 1877, in the words of General Franklin: "General McDowell informed me that the Secretary of War had told him about an hour before that General McClellan intended to work by strategy and not by fighting, and that he should not have another man from his Department; that all of the enemies of the Administration centered around him; and the Secretary accused him of having political ambition. Also, that he had not left the number of troops to defend Washington that the President required; in other words, that he had disobeyed the President's orders. General McDowell remonstrated against the step which was about to be taken, arguing that, if General McClellan had political aspirations, they would be forwarded by the very course which the Administration was taking in this case. He used all the arguments which he could bring to bear, to convince the Secretary that he was making a mistake in ordering the detachment of his corps. The result was, General McDowell's corps was detached from the Army of the Potomac, and was marched to Catlett's Station on the Orange and Alexandria Railroad, where it could do no possible good. General McClellan's plan of turning Yorktown, by the movement of McDowell's corps on the north bank of the York River, was utterly destroyed. The Army of the Potomac was forced to stay a whole month on the Peninsula uselessly, and the capture of Richmond, which in all human probability would have been made in the month of May, had General McClellan's plan been carried out, was deferred for three years."

General Franklin now writes to us as follows, inclosing a copy of his paper in the "Philadelphia Times": "On the evening of the arrival of General McDowell's corps at Catlett's Station (about April 8th or 9th), my division, which then formed part of the corps, was ordered to join General McClellan by way of Alexandria. While it was marching to Alexandria I went to the Peninsula, saw and conferred with the General [McClellan], and returned to Alexandria to embark the division on the transports. When I was ready to start, I was informed that the President and Secretary of War wished to see me. I first saw Mr. Stanton. He was very cordial, was glad I was going to the Peninsula, would at once determine a question of my rank which was before him. He desired me to give his love to McClellan, and to say to him that he had his best wishes for his success, and that any help to him which he required that his Department could furnish would be most cheerfully accorded. In fact, nothing could have been more satisfactory to any friend of McClellan than this interview would have been to me, had not the recollection of McDowell's interview with Stanton

It seems to us most remarkable, in all this concatenation of conspiracies against the usefulness and success of a military man who was serving the country with singleness of purpose and with no ambition but to do his military duty, that Mr. Lincoln, with his imputed shrewdness, did not see to the very bottom of the hearts of men who wished to put enmity between him and this faithful soldier. Mr. Lincoln should have had the wisdom to remember that the Harrison's Landing letter, instead of affording even a political reason for depriving the country of General McClellan's military services, was entirely under his (Mr. Lincoln's) own control; for General McClellan had not divulged its contents, and as a man of honor he could never have divulged them for any purpose but to shield himself from an unjust imputation. After it had been imputed to him that he wrote the letter for a selfish political purpose, he included a copy of it in his report, that the whole world might judge of its character. A portion of his countrymen, knowing little of the facts, and paying but little heed to the character of the letter, have permitted an unjust impression to remain in their minds. It is time for them to correct their impressions, and to observe that, if Mr. Lincoln had looked into the letter, when McClellan's ene-

of April 3d been fresh in my mind. I never saw Stanton after this interview. The interview with the President amounted to nothing."

We do not know where, in the history of any country, there is anything so grotesque as the fact that the destinies of a great war were to a large extent in the hands of a mere lawyer who, apart from his propensity to resort to duplicity when there was no need for it whatever, was completely destitute of all military knowledge or judgment. Such administrative faculty as Mr. Stanton had was due to the energy of an imperious will. President Buchanan, who gauged Mr. Stanton accurately when he was his Attorney-General, has left the following brief description of him, which now lies before us in Mr. Buchanan's handwriting:

"Mr. Stanton was an able, astute, and somewhat overbearing, dogmatic lawyer. He had been eminently and deservedly successful at the bar. His personal integrity has never been doubted. He was, however, deficient in the knowledge of a statesman; but he performed his duties as Attorney-General in a respectable and satisfactory manner. He had not the calmness and sober judgment that would have fitted him for an important administrative office. He was rash and impetuous. It was his nature to act from the impulse of the moment, and he did not stop to inquire into the remote consequences of his decision." This was evidently written before Mr. Stanton became Mr. Lincoln's Secretary of War. What it says of his personal integrity relates to all matters of money. In that respect Mr. Stanton's character was without a stain. His personal duplicity, toward those who trusted him and whom he professed to serve, is an enigma which those who knew him best never could understand. He was as false to Buchanan as he was to others, and it is to be hoped that Mr. Buchanan died without knowing that he was so.

mies were perpetually trying to awaken his jealousy, he must have seen that, whatever else it was, it was no "platform" for a Democratic politician to put himself upon in the summer of 1862. But, according to the theory on which we are commenting, Mr. Lincoln, although he had it entirely in his power, in the autumn of 1862, to recognize the true character of that letter as a private suggestion of a policy to be adopted by him and made his own if he should think well of it, could not, nevertheless, resist the representations of McClellan's enemies that it was designed for a very different purpose. No man can read that letter now, whether he knows General McClellan or not, and find in it any trace of the design that was imputed to him. No man who knows General McClellan, and knows the political history of the time when the letter was written, can believe that he ever had such a design.*

On the night of the same day on which the removal of General McClellan was considered in the Cabinet, the elder Mr. Blair, as the reader has seen, visited Mr. Lincoln, and patriotically endeavored to dissuade him from that step. At the meeting of the Cabinet on the 5th Mr. Lincoln made no allusion to the Harrison's Landing letter, for some of the gentlemen present did not know of its existence. The discussion in the Cabinet turned wholly on General McClellan's activity as a commander, and his alleged misrepresentation of the actual condition of his army in respect to the supplies, after the battle of Antietam. When Mr. Blair saw the President on that evening, the latter remarked that he had said he would remove McClellan if he allowed Lee's army to get away from him, and that he must remove him. When Mr. Blair saw Mr. Lincoln

* It must be remembered that the letter was written in July, 1862. One copy of it remained in manuscript in General McClellan's possession. In August, 1863, General McClellan drew up and transmitted to the War Department his report on the military operations in which he had been engaged. The report remained in the Adjutant-General's office until it was sent into Congress at its next session, which commenced in December, 1863. It contained a correct copy of the Harrison's Landing letter. Soon after the report began to be printed by the printer of public documents, the newspaper press began to comment upon and to copy from it. An imperfect copy of the letter appeared in a New York paper in January, 1864; but how it was obtained is not known. An edition of General McClellan's report was published by Sheldon & Co., at New York, in the spring of 1864; and from that edition the public obtained the first authentic copy of the Harrison's Landing letter that was ever authorized by General McClellan. He was removed from command and sent into retirement in November, 1862. In the early part of November, 1864, he resigned from the army.

on the next day, Mr. Lincoln said, "Mr. Blair, I was obliged to play *shut pan* to you last night." The order for the change in the command had then come out, and Mr. Lincoln felt obliged to account to Mr. Blair for not having told him on the previous evening that the matter had been decided. The question arises, therefore, To whom had the President said that he would remove McClellan if he allowed Lee's army to get away from him? Certainly he never said so to General McClellan himself. On the field of Antietam, twelve days after Lee's army had recrossed the Potomac, Mr. Lincoln told General McClellan that he did not intend to displace him, and that he was not to move on the enemy until he felt that he was entirely ready. On the 6th of October the President ordered him to pursue Lee; but on the 21st the President knew that it was at least doubtful whether he was in a condition to do so, and a little later the President learned that he certainly was not. If we go forward to the 5th of November, after McClellan, properly supplied, had placed his army in the best possible positions for dividing Lee's forces and beating them in detail, we find the Cabinet council sitting at the White House debating the question of his removal from command. At that meeting the old story of unnecessary delay after the battle of Antietam was again trumped up, and, notwithstanding the information that had been obtained by Colonel Scott and communicated to the President, the Secretary of War, and General Halleck, which made it certain that the delay had been wholly due to the want of indispensable supplies, at least one member of the Cabinet, who had been a steadfast supporter of General McClellan upon public grounds, was made to admit, on General Halleck's "statements," that there had been unnecessary delay after the battle of Antietam. We do not know how to characterize that scene at the President's council-table. We were about to use a word which we withhold. We can only point to the fact that, at the very moment of that discussion on the proposal to remove General McClellan from command, his headquarters were at Rectortown; his army, in admirable discipline and spirit, was disposed in position for successive attacks upon Lee's divided troops; and it was yet an undecided question whether Lee was to escape, while the chances were entirely against him. For General Lee, however, that question was decided by the change in the Federal command—a change that was made upon a pretext which more than one person around that council-board knew to be false.

Involved as Mr. Lincoln was in the toils laid for him by Chase, Stanton, and Halleck, we do not believe that he had it in his power to assign publicly a reason for removing McClellan. The subject of McClellan's allowing Lee's army to escape was not discussed in the Cabinet. On the evening of the day on which that discussion took place, Mr. Lincoln had to say something to the elder Mr. Blair, and he went back to an old promise which he had given to somebody, that he would remove McClellan if he allowed Lee's army to get away from him. But at that moment McClellan was about to attack Longstreet, and the result, which had not occurred, could not have been the reason why Mr. Lincoln had already allowed the order to be issued. At the Cabinet meeting, the reason urged was a delay that had occurred on the field of Antietam during the three weeks that ended on the last days of October. After the Cabinet council broke up, there must have been a private conference between Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Chase and Mr. Stanton, during which Mr. Lincoln consented that the order should be issued, and that the name of General Burnside should be inserted in it as the successor of McClellan. But, if Mr. Lincoln had ever been asked thereafter to assign the reason why he allowed that order to be issued, we are entirely unable to see what he could have said. But, valuing McClellan highly, as we believe he did, and knowing as he did that McClellan was at that moment pursuing Lee's army by his orders, Mr. Lincoln was so entrapped by McClellan's enemies that he could not extricate himself without sacrificing McClellan; for he knew that Halleck's "statements," produced and listened to at the Council-board, could be produced elsewhere, and would be given to the public if he allowed McClellan to remain at the head of the army. This would have produced a public issue respecting the mode in which affairs had been managed by the War Department, in meeting or failing to meet General McClellan's requisitions during the month of October.

There is another theory, less common than the one which we have thus far considered, by which some persons think that General McClellan's removal from command is to be accounted for. This theory is entertained by officers of the army, who, while abstaining habitually from all party or political relations, were deeply interested in observing the course of the Administration in the prosecution of the war. It is this: That in the summer and autumn of 1862, after the defeat of Pope, followed by McClellan's expulsion of the Confederate troops from Maryland, the President's advisers,

who were represented by Mr. Chase and Mr. Stanton, did not desire further military successes in the war until they should have made it a war for the extermination of slavery. In support of this theory those who entertain it point to the following facts: That if McClellan had captured Richmond in November or December, 1862, the proclamation would have remained, as what Mr. Lincoln described it, a "bull against the comet"; because, if the rebellion had been crushed then and there, the Constitution, notwithstanding the proclamation, must have remained what it always had been; that, after McClellan, came Burnside and Hooker, who were not more effectually sustained and supported by the Administration than McClellan had been; and that when it was determined to remove McClellan, so that Richmond might not fall prematurely, it was a sort of hap-hazard choice that at the last moment of deliberation made Burnside his immediate successor. This is not a theory which has been the result of an afterthought. There were intelligent and observing officers of that army who knew that McClellan, on the one hand, was straining every nerve to overtake and defeat the Confederate forces at the moment when he was displaced, and who, on the other hand, believed, at that time, that he was not permitted to succeed because the Administration did not then desire success. It is impossible, of course, to penetrate into the secret counsels of those who then controlled the course of the war. What we can see, however, is that the removal of General McClellan entailed the frightful slaughter at Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville, and the Confederate invasion of Pennsylvania. In our last paper we presented to our readers an accurate sketch, from which they could learn with what excellent strategy McClellan was operating, to insure the fall of Richmond with the least expenditure of precious lives. We doubt if one reader out of every hundred has ever before understood how the severance of the communications between the two parts of Lee's army, and the forcing of Longstreet back upon Gordonsville—results that were within McClellan's grasp on the 7th of November, 1862—would have opened to him an almost unopposed march upon Richmond. Yet this commander, thus arrested by his own Government when he was about to achieve a great success—arrested from a motive of statecraft, or from a motive of personal jealousy, or from a combination of both—is the man whose reputation has been slurred because he did not sacrifice his men by hecatombs, from which nothing could be gained, but sought to attain his object by occupying positions

that would make a battle and a victory worth what they might cost.*

In reference to the political motives by which Mr. Lincoln is supposed to have been influenced, we have considered all the theories that have ever been suggested. Whatever theory of political motive is the one that ought to be adopted, the deplorable fact remains that the country lost the services of General McClellan, and that great disasters ensued. At Fredericksburg, in December, 1862, under Burnside, the Federal losses, in killed, wounded, and missing, were 12,321. At Chancellorsville, under Hooker, in May, 1863, the killed and wounded were 11,033. These losses were entirely uncompensated by any advantage or prestige. In June the Confederates invaded Pennsylvania, and were barely checked at Gettysburg. Remembering these consequences, we are forced also to remember that, if anything in war can be pronounced to have been so highly probable as to amount to a moral certainty, it is that, if

* At Warrenton, after the soldiers had learned that McClellan was to leave them, and as he rode through the ranks that lined the road for miles, the men called out to him repeatedly, "Come back, Little Mac!" McClellan turned to an officer who rode by his side, and, with tears gathering in his eyes, asked, "What do you think of all this?" "It is hard upon you, but best for us." "Why?" "Because you are not permitted to succeed, and, as the people in Washington do not intend that we shall fight at present, we shall be saved defeat and mortification. You will come back when you are wanted." Laying his hand on the officer's shoulder, the General asked, "How did you learn so much?" Our informant adds that he did not think at the time how soon he was to witness Fredericksburg.

A very fair writer on the "Campaigns of the Army of the Potomac" (Swinton, New York, 1866) was at a loss to understand why Burnside abandoned at Warrenton all of McClellan's plans, and, turning his back on Lee's army, marched his own army to Fredericksburg. He says that this project, although not approved at Washington, *was assented to;* that is to say, the Administration abandoned the pursuit of Lee's army, and allowed their own army to be transferred to Fredericksburg, without one effort to carry out McClellan's plan of operations. This could have been done only for the purpose of obtaining a new base, where the Army of the Potomac could remain inactive until the spring. But the swift pursuit of Lee, whose whole forces arrived on the south bank of the Rappahannock, for the relief of Fredericksburg, within a week after Burnside's army had reached the river, disconcerted the whole project of "winter quarters" at Fredericksburg, and ended in conflicts which produced what Mr. Swinton justly calls "a slaughter the most bloody and the most useless of the war." While General Burnside must be considered to have been excessively rash in attempting to carry Lee's positions by assault, it should be remembered that he was at Fredericksburg at all by the assent of the Government. The motive which led to that assent is believed, by many officers of high intelligence, to have been a secret determination to let the war in Virginia stand still until the effect of the emancipation proclamation had been fully developed.

McClellan had been allowed to fight Lee again, there would have been another victory, which would have insured the capture of Richmond before the end of the year 1862. The blood with which the Wilderness was afterward watered would have been saved.

We shall now close our review of this part of General McClellan's military career with a summary, which may assist our readers in forming an opinion of the justice of a criticism which has long been used to excuse the conduct of the Administration. The criticism has most commonly been put in this form: that while General McClellan had great accomplishments as an organizer of armies and as an engineer, yet as a general at the head of troops he lacked decision, promptness, and vigor, from a constitutional infirmity which made him reluctant to strike a blow until he had accumulated every possible advantage for delivering it. The soundness of this criticism—supposing it to be honestly made—may be tested by the history of the period over which we have passed in these papers. We have followed General McClellan for the space of a little less than five months, from the 26th of June to the 7th of November, 1862. The week extending from the 26th of June to the 4th of July, in which there was more severe fighting than any one of our armies in an equal period ever encountered, ended in the rescue of the Army of the Potomac from an extraordinary peril, into which it was brought by the blundering folly of its own Government. No competent critic will deny that the tactics, the force of will, the indomitable perseverance, and the admirable judgment displayed by McClellan during the seven days' march to the James, evinced the highest attributes of a military commander; for no such critic will question that to rescue an army, on such a march, from the clutches of a superior force, is as great an achievement as to fight and win a pitched battle with equal or nearly equal numbers on the two sides. From the 4th of July to the 5th of August, a period of comparative inactivity on the James necessarily followed, in consequence of the indecision of the Government as to what was to be done. From the 5th of August to the 16th, McClellan could do nothing but execute the orders of his superiors to remove his army to the front of Washington. From the 16th of August to the 27th, he was engaged in transferring the different bodies of his army to the command of General Pope. From the 27th of August until the morning of the 2d of September, he was without the command of more than a hundred men.

Into the next two weeks, when called upon to save the capital,

he crowded an amount of energy, skill, promptness, and vigor, which should alone have made a great reputation, if he had never done anything else. If we break up those two weeks into their important subdivisions, we have, first, the five days which followed his resumption of command, when he took a defeated and demoralized army that was swarming toward the capital in the night, immediately restored its discipline, posted it within the defenses of the city, reconstructed some of its organizations, and then threw it forward on a march to intercept an enemy flushed with his recent victory and preparing to come down upon the Maryland side of the Potomac. During the week that intervened between the 7th and the 13th of September, McClellan was moving his columns on five parallel routes, so that he might encounter Lee before the latter could descend upon Washington by an unoccupied and unguarded road, either next to or away from the river. In one week this march was accomplished, notwithstanding the cautions with which it had to be made. On the 13th, Lee's plans were revealed; and it affords abundant proof of the sound judgment with which McClellan had conducted his march, and of the spirit and efficiency which he had restored to the troops, that the very first blow which he struck sent the whole Confederate army into retreat. The blow that was given at South Mountain was dealt on the twelfth day after McClellan resumed the command, and on the next day after that on which Lee's position became known; and on the same day General Franklin, one of McClellan's most energetic lieutenants, attacked and carried the pass called Crampton's Gap, on the left, while the main body of McClellan's troops attacked the Confederates at South Mountain. In three days after South Mountain, the Confederate army was overtaken on the field of Antietam, and on the night of the fourth day their shattered forces were withdrawn into Virginia, after a desperately fought battle which lasted for fourteen hours.

Carping criticism, imputations of "slowness," charges of hesitation and want of vigor, vanish into the realm of nonsense, in the face of such achievements. When we look back upon what was accomplished in the two weeks that followed McClellan's restoration to command, with an army which he took off the hands of a general under whom it had been shockingly beaten, and when we remember that McClellan, as he marched out of Washington, left behind him in high authority many officials who wished him anything but success, we can only wonder at the easy credulity of that

portion of the contemporary public who supposed him to be either slow or inefficient as a commander. The false impressions which one age derives from its own prejudices, that have been industriously cultivated for the transient policies of political or personal hostility, are a poor guide to the estimation in which a man is to be held in history. Beyond the range of their influence, even to-day, the military reputation of General McClellan among the best European judges is so high that it has often been said that he would have terminated the war in November or December, 1862, if he had been kept in the field and been supported and supplied as other generals subsequently were. We have heard, from a source that left us no reason to doubt the authenticity of the anecdote, that General von Moltke once expressed this opinion to an American who in conversation gave him to understand that "some of us in America do not estimate McClellan so highly as we do some others of our generals." "It may be so," said the great Prussian commander, "but let me tell you that, if your Government had supported General McClellan in the field as they should have done, your war would have been ended two years sooner than it was."

But it is not necessary to look abroad in order to measure what we lost by the removal of McClellan from the public service. The history of the war in Virginia, after Antietam and after the removal of McClellan from command, is a history of the endeavor of our Government to reëstablish the Union armies in the position before Richmond which they had occupied in June, 1862, when the Government withdrew from McClellan its promised support, and left him to save his army by the flank movement to the James. That subsequent history embraces the battles of Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, the Wilderness, and other fierce fights along the bloody overland route from Washington to Richmond. With these before him, the reader is compelled to ask himself whether, after Antietam, there was any battle fought between those two cities in which the Confederates were beaten and driven from the field; and why the patriotic North was called upon for a lavish expenditure of treasure and of men to supply the places of the countless dead who fell in the effort to regain that old position before the capital of Virginia. The enemy fell back before the overwhelming forces of the inexhaustible Union. In 1865 they were utterly crushed and subdued, on the same ground from which, in 1862, the Army of the Potomac was withdrawn, in disregard of the earnest appeals of its com-

mander, who did not cease to reiterate the memorable words of his dispatch to General Halleck, of August 4, 1862: "Here is the true defense of Washington; it is here, on the banks of the James, that the fate of the Union is to be decided."

Yet it was not for the glory snatched from McClellan that we have ever grieved. All talent, power, accomplishment, knowledge, experience, skill, and valor of the soldier form, when rightly regarded, a trust for his country; and we are sure that General McClellan never has regretted and never can regret that he so regarded and used the gifts which it pleased Heaven to bestow upon him. Among all the distinguished military men of this or any other age, of whom the world knows so much as it knows of McClellan, there has been no man whose ambition was so perfectly unalloyed by the base element of self-seeking at the expense of others, and no man who has suffered so much injustice from official superiors. Yet that injustice has not caused him to challenge his detractors upon the issues that were made against him. Not at the time when that injustice was committed, not in the long period of eighteen years that has since elapsed, has he broken the reticence which is a part of his nature when his own public conduct or that of others is in question. That he will at some time break this silence, so far as to relate facts which he alone can tell, at least for those who are to come after us, his contemporaries should, as we believe they do, earnestly desire.

GEORGE TICKNOR CURTIS.

HAS THE SOUTHERN PULPIT FAILED?

WHO has been practicing upon the credulity of the Rev. David Swing? or how in the name of common honesty has he become possessed with the idea that the Southern pulpit has failed? He does not produce a scrap of evidence to lay a foundation in fact for his strange hallucination. His paper would not have been more astounding in its audacity, if it had been an effort to account for the failure of the Southern soil, or to explain the failure of the Southern sun to longer quicken and mature the cotton-plant!

He is content with no middle flight—he would be profound and philosophical; and so he summons at once the *manes* of Francis Bacon. How strange it is that men may admire and extol the "Novum Organum," and yet fail to understand, or wholly misapply, the simplest doctrines of the inductive philosophy! It would have been reasonable to suppose that one so enamored of the scientific method would have begun with particulars, and thus ascended to the enunciation of a proposition so astounding—one, so far as we know, never before sprung upon the world; but, instead of this, he has given us a brilliant example of the dogmatic method of the schoolmen which he so much abhors. If the story were not somewhat stale, we should like to recite for his benefit the artifice which, it is said, a certain monarch practiced upon his *savants* when he called upon them to explain why it was that a vessel of water does not weigh more with a live fish in it than it does without the fish! Sure it is, that he assumes for granted a proposition singularly at variance from fact, and then coolly sets himself to work to explain the absurdity.

This is itself such a remarkable phenomenon that we are impelled to look for some explanation of it; and where better can we look than in that authority which he so heartily commends and so strangely offends? In the "Novum Organum" we read: "The human understanding resembles not a *dry light*, but admits a tinc-

ture of the will and passions, which generate their own system accordingly; for man always believes more readily that which he prefers." And, by way of corollary, we find in the "De Augmentis": "Another error is an impatience of doubt and haste to assertion without due and mature suspension of judgment. For the two ways of contemplation are not unlike the two ways of action commonly spoken of by the ancients—the one plain and smooth in the beginning and in the end impassable; the other rough and troublesome in the entrance, but after a while fair and even: so it is in contemplation; if a man will begin with certainties, he will end in doubt; but, if he will be content to begin with doubt, he shall end in certainties."

The dogmatic stride of the distinguished author of the paper under review is not a little marred by the limp in his logic. At one moment he pathetically exclaims, "How are the mighty fallen!" and the next he is tempted to abandon the inquiry with the reflection, "It never was well." But, whichever way he will have it, since we are quite ready to exonerate him from any malicious intention to misrepresent the Southern clergy, we must conclude that his information is very limited. The earnestness and power of the Southern pulpit have always been an admitted fact, as well in the North as in the South. Its representative men have always enjoyed the generous and hearty applause of their brethren in the North. There must be many people in New York who remember a remarkable scene at the old Tabernacle in that city in 1844. Dr. Bascom was to preach at night. Long before the time, the immense building was thronged so that not another soul could find room. The preacher began, and at once carried the vast concourse up to the highest pitch of tension. At three several times the proprieties of the place were quite forgotten, and the whole congregation burst forth in long and loud applause! Henry Clay declared him to be the "greatest natural orator in America." Marvelous things are told of his preaching. Entire congregations would rise unconsciously, and press toward the pulpit in uncontrollable excitement. On one occasion he produced such a frenzy of excitement by a morning sermon at a camp-meeting that nobody could be heard all the day through.

On another occasion in Kentucky Mr. Clay was in the congregation. He listened for some time to the daring sweep of thought, the electric and impetuous declamation, the searching appeals to conscience, until at last he was carried beyond all bounds of propriety, and gave vent to his excitement by exclaiming: "Well done,

Bascom—give it to them, give it to them!" When Dr. Bascom was chaplain in Congress, General Jackson was carried away in a similar manner by the vividness of a picture he was painting, and exclaimed aloud, "My God, he is lost!"

The South has always been full of men noted for their pulpit eloquence. How could it be otherwise among a people of open and generous impulses—in the land of all others in the world given to the freest and most open interchange of opinions in public assemblies? The South is the home of natural oratory, and from the days of Patrick Henry every hamlet has had fluent and forcible speakers.

Nor has the style of pulpit-speaking been at all confined to the rugged and exciting type of oratory. The South has produced, and still has, men of smoothest periods and most polished diction. Who that ever heard the great Dr. Hawks can forget his polished accents and his irresistible logic? How all who were present at his trial in New York delight to describe the matchless power by which he held that vast assembly in a thrill of excitement for days together! The people of New York will not soon forget this great master of eloquence and logic. Few men could have maintained the position he did through the stormy scenes of the war, when he refused either to withdraw or bend before the torrent of excitement.

And, again, in all the catalogue of eminent clergymen, what name is there which to this day will call up a deeper sense of reverence than that of Bishop Elliott, of Georgia? Dignity and culture, piety and power, were so wondrously blended in him that, with all the gentleness of a woman, he possessed the strength of a giant. His carriage and manner were inimitable. He was one of the committee appointed by the House of Bishops to adjust the unfortunate and vexatious Onderdonk difficulty. He presented and read the paper containing the concessions of Bishop Onderdonk. After it had been accepted and the case dismissed, Bishop Meade, of Virginia, who was not a little incensed at the action, approached the Bishop of Georgia, and said: "Elliott, that was all your doing. Your sympathetic tone and soft accents in reading that paper carried the House out of their senses. They never would have accepted it if anybody else had read it." Truly, the fame of this great Bishop is in all the churches. When shall we look upon his like again?

And then, again, that other Georgian whose life ran parallel with that of Bishop Elliott's through so many years—Dr. Lovick Pierce, so late fallen asleep. When great preachers are mentioned,

his name can not fail to rise to the lips of all who knew him, and who did not? The celebrated Dr. Olin bore testimony to his wondrous powers in the strong emotion, even to tears, which he is known to have shown under the effect of his preaching, as well as in the deliberate declaration that, "if left to choose among all the preachers in America the one under whose ministrations he should sit for years, Dr. Pierce would be the man of his choice."

And then there was Dr. William Capers, of South Carolina. In what enthusiastic terms the English bore testimony to the simplicity, and purity, and fervor of his preaching when he visited England in 1828, as the representative of the Methodist Church in America! When asked how he had acquired his pure Saxon style and simple earnestness, he replied that he did not know, unless it was in preaching to the simple-minded blacks upon the rice-plantations of Carolina.

In the memorable debate in the General Conference in New York in 1844, upon the case of Bishop Andrew, and which led to the unfortunate separation of the Methodist Church into North and South, the speaking of the Southern men was of the most brilliant type, as any one who remembers will bear witness, and the accounts given at the time will fully show. Dr. Winans, of the Mississippi Conference, opened the debate on the Southern side—"an impetuous speaker, after the Greek model. His massive strength, put in motion by a glowing spirit, furnished a mighty momentum which struck like the swell of the sea when stormy winds rule the waters." Remarkable speeches were made by Dr. William A. Smith, of Virginia; the Pierces, father and son; and Dr. Longstreet, of Georgia, Mr. Stringfellow, of North Carolina, and Dr. Green, of Tennessee. Dr. Capers spoke last. His bearing was marked by the highest refinement of manner. Though speaking at the close of a prolonged and exciting debate, his perfect command of voice, his easy flow of words, and his clear and vigorous thought held that weary body with a freshness and power which belonged rather to an opening effort. We speak of these things because they are historical, and because there must be many who can bear witness to their faithfulness.

The Presbyterians have had their full share of eminent preachers. There was the celebrated Dr. Thornwell, so powerful in controversy, so thorough in scholarship, so eloquent in manner. Where can we look for greater purity of character, sounder learning, or greater pulpit powers? The venerable Dr. Plummer, too, still with his

harness on, ranks with the foremost preachers in any land. With these men comes up the memory of the world-distinguished Dr. Bachman, of the Lutheran Church in Charleston, the associate and collaborator of Audubon. The stalwart blows he dealt the materialists, as the modern tide of infidelity came in, must be fresh in the memory of all who know anything of such matters. His reputation was not confined to this continent; he was a corresponding member of nearly all the learned societies of Europe. The Andrews, of Virginia, so intimately associated with Princeton, are too widely known to require more than a mere mention. Dr. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, was a man of Herculean mold.

Of the many eminent men among the Baptists we barely mention Jesse Mercer, of Georgia, who has given his name to Mercer University; Richard Furman, after whom Furman University is called; Andrew Broadus, a peerless pulpit orator, sometimes called "the Robert Hall of America"; Richard Fuller, of South Carolina, pastor for more than a quarter of a century in Baltimore; and Jeremiah B. Jeter, a writer and speaker of transcendent powers. The list could be prolonged indefinitely.

Some mention has already been made of the Episcopal clergy, but we can not forbear a reference to Bishop Ravenscroft, of North Carolina; Bishops Meade and Johns, of Virginia; Whittingham, of Maryland; Otey, of Tennessee; Cobbs, of Alabama, and Wilmer, of Louisiana.

The Roman Catholics have also had men of eminent parts in the South, such as Archbishop Kenrick, of Baltimore; Bishops England, of Charleston, and McGill, of Richmond. Surely, the past of the pulpit in the South teems with men of gigantic stature.

If we do not speak much of the present, it is not because there is not much to be said. If there has been any decadence in the pulpit, nobody in the South has yet discovered it. Where are there finer pulpit orators than Drs. Palmer, of New Orleans; Hoge, of Richmond; Dagg, of Georgia; and Robinson, of Kentucky? Bishop Beckwith has an immense reputation, as well in the North as in the South. Bishop Wilmer, of Alabama; Quintard, of Tennessee; Garret and Elliott, of Texas, are all superior preachers. The number of distinguished men who come to mind is so great that it is an embarrassment to decide whom to name.

But to return to Mr. Swing's paper. If his proposition were not "the baseless fabric of a vision," but a substantial reality, he would still be singularly unhappy in every point he advances as an ex-

planation. He says, first, "All will at once affirm that the institution of slavery laid low this organized eloquence . . . . under a political and social philosophy which stole labor, all intellectual pursuits declined on account of the well-known principle that mind is brought out by action, just as the luster of the diamond is brought into existence by the polishing process of the lapidary."

It is certainly neither generous nor honest to charge the South with having *stolen* labor. We have no mind to go over the old question, which we had hoped had gone to rest, as to who was originally responsible for American slavery. Mr. Swing knows, everybody knows, that the British Government imposed slaves upon every one of the original colonies, and that, when the American Government was formed, slavery existed in every one of the original States. He knows that not one of those States declared slavery a sin against God, or a violation of sound morals; and that no State ever passed an act liberating her slaves, *ipso facto*, that they were mere acts of limitation, interfering with no vested rights; that, with small exception, the slaves were sold into the States farther south, and the money duly paid to Northern men, who were far from suspecting that they were committing a crime in receiving it. He must know further that the South never was engaged to any considerable extent in prosecuting the slave-trade; that the most serious objections to that traffic came from the South, and that Northern interests maintained it. We ask, then, is it generous, is it honest, to say of the South, "while she stole labor, Nature in dreadful equity was stealing away her intellect and sentiment"?

But laying apart the ethical complexion of this fearful charge, is it true that Nature was "stealing away her intellect and sentiment"? Whatever intellect and sentiment the South ever had, was reared under the slavery *régime*, and has she never shown "intellect and sentiment"? Shall we have to go over the long list of her statesmen, her soldiers, and her men of letters? Shall we begin with the "Father of his Country" and go down the list of Presidents; go through the cabinets and look for the leading names in both branches of Congress! Are Patrick Henry, and Thomas Jefferson, Chief Justice Marshall, and William Wirt, Clay, Calhoun, and Pinckney, and all the rest forgotten?

Is no account to be taken of such men as Winfield Scott and Zachary Taylor, Washington Allston, and Commodore Maury? Are the people of the North prepared to go back upon the memory of the gallant men who have helped to shed luster upon their

arms—men like Farragut and Thomas? And can any man forget that pure, grand soldier and Christian gentleman—who, when his columns had been hurled back, shattered and bleeding, at Gettysburg, could say to his sobbing general, "Never mind, it was all my fault"—Robert E. Lee?

Lack of space forbids us to go even hastily over the list of Southern names distinguished in literature and science, poetry and the arts; but a candid public will admit that she has not been wanting, even in science and the humanities.

But what an idea Mr. Swing must have of Southern life as it was, or as it is! He seems to think it a sort of *dolce-far-niente* existence—a dreamy state of inanition, only varied now and then by a whack at poor Sambo! Why, laziness was never any more admired, and little more practiced, at the South than at the North. Manliness and energy of character were always demanded, and as a rule expectation in this regard was not disappointed. When was it that enterprise and courage were required in her sons that they were found wanting? And, besides, only a small part of the people were slaveholders, and in point of fact there was really less dawdling or femininity among the sons of planters than is found among the sons of wealthy men in other parts of the world. They lived on horseback, engaged in field-sports, and all manner of outdoor exercises. Their surroundings were highly favorable to both intellectual and physical development. Without claiming that there were not serious faults in the general type of Southern character, there never was a land in which true manliness was better understood or more commonly found.

But, as a second reason to explain his gratuitous assumption, Mr. Swing tells us: "To the intellectual sluggishness which the prevalence of substitutional labor entailed upon all the forms of mental activity in common, slavery added a special shape of misfortune to the lot of the Southern clergyman. It divided society into three castes, and made him the pastor of only one division. In a slightly modified form, caste holds, or held the South as firmly as it held India before it was subject to British rule. Three shapes of humanity lay before the parson of the cotton States—the slaveholders, the poor whites, and the slaves. Immense merit attached to the first class; the last class lay far over toward the animal world, and salvation followed this law of decrease, and was offered with some zeal to the first families, was often suggested to the poor whites as being desirable, and died away wholly before it reached

the ears of those whose complexion was of a dark or mixed character. Prevented thus by political interests and prejudices from dealing with those who most needed the teachings and pity of Heaven, compelled to harden his heart against the cries of those in bonds, and often in torments under the lash, the herald of Jesus Christ slowly became a dealer in intellectual abstractions, or an apologist for a shameful institution and its attendant personal vices. Without doubt the situation was peculiar; the slave was too contemptible to merit any salvation, the master was too great to need any.'

We do not think Mr. Swing can be at all conscious of the dreadful misrepresentations contained in this amazing paragraph. He betrays at every point the most stupendous ignorance of the South; but surely he ought not to have brought such an indictment without careful consideration. We are utterly at a loss to understand how even his knowledge of human nature failed to tell him that in "the eternal fitness of things" this could not be true in a land where—somehow he has learned—"the people are so warm-hearted." He must surely have read "Uncle Tom's Cabin"—which, it is to be presumed, we may quote as canonical—and he must remember the sterling piety which Uncle Tom learned in the Shelby family—a family intended to represent a large part of the South, and all that must have come somehow from the pulpit. There were many thousand Bibles as curiously marked as Uncle Tom's, and his religion was not an isolated case. We have the witness of the trader Haley for that: "I know there's differences in religion. Some kinds is mis'rable: there's your meetin' pious; there's your singin' roarin' pious: them ain't no account, in black or white; these rayly is; and I've seen it in niggers as often as any, your rail softly, stiddy, honest pious, that the hull world couldn't tempt 'em to do nothing that they thinks is wrong."

But let us go a little further back in these wild assertions of Mr. Swing; let us look at his theory of Southern caste. No doubt it seems very plausible, to one who knows nothing about the South, that in the days of slavery there should have been the threefold stratification which he so dogmatically assumes; but, incomprehensible as it may seem to him, the history of modern society may be searched in vain to find any land in which there was such an entire absence of caste as in the old slave States. We can confidently appeal to all who have ever lived in the South in support of this fact. Nor is the explanation difficult. It was due to the presence of that very institution which he so sadly misreads. The

fact that there was a broad line of race and color which no man could fail to recognize, went far toward keeping down all mere artificial lines of man's devising. It gave the white man, however humble his lot, a prerogative which he nowhere else enjoyed on the face of the earth. There was no menial class among the whites, but every man held himself to be the peer of every other. Let any man, who knows the facts, say if it was ever the custom in the South to send the poor man by the back way to find scraps in kitchens when they had need of food. White men, just because they were white, entered at front doors and were received in parlors with a politeness and hospitality which were a constant source of surprise to people of other lands accustomed to what are called social distinctions. The table and the drawing-room knew no such distinctions as are found everywhere in societies founded upon the pitiless conflict between labor and capital.

And here, again, it should seem that Dr. Swing might have caught some glimpse of this extraordinary fact in that (take it altogether) faithful delineation of Southern life, "Uncle Tom's Cabin." The book opens with the scene of "two gentlemen sitting alone over their wine." Mrs. Stowe uses the right word *gentlemen*, according to Southern parlance, though she at once goes on to explain that one of them was not a gentleman at all, but a coarse, illiterate, despicable slave-trader—a character thoroughly despised throughout the South. Grotesque as it all was, every white man called himself, and it was at his peril if anybody failed to call him, a gentleman. It is changing now, more's the pity, and class distinctions are rapidly showing these hideous outlines.

In a community organized upon this broad plane of social equality, how improbable on the face of it is the satire that "[salvation] was often suggested to the poor whites as being desirable"! Why, in simple truth, it was from the non-slaveholding class that the communicants of the Church were chiefly drawn. It was too often the case that the larger planters were content to encourage others to be religious, but stood somewhat aloof themselves. Thus, there never was anything more out of joint than the charge that the non-slaveholding class was neglected or contemned in the ministrations of the clergy of the South.

And now with regard to the slaves. It would be the gravest error to suppose that this equality among the whites was at their expense. The white man, protected as he was by the difference in race, had no room to fear that his respectability would in the least

suffer by any proper contact with the slaves; and, accordingly, the colored people were admitted to the freest intercourse whenever their presence was proper.

Now, we have no mind to deny or minimize the great evils attendant upon slavery. There were brutes and madmen in the South, as there are in all quarters of the world, and wherever they have power they are sure to be guilty of atrocities. Mrs. Stowe's human monster, Legree, did, no doubt, exist now and then; and the frightful scene she paints was possible at rare intervals; but the bond of master and slave was not the cause of such outrages—it was the result of the diabolism of certain human hearts, and slavery offered but one out of many relationships in this world for its manifestation. Nobody can seriously deny that like horrors are often witnessed from the hold men have upon their wives, and parents have upon their children. The difference is this—and we concede it freely—the bond of master and slave was not a necessary one, and could be dissolved; while that of the others is of nature, and therefore can not; or, rather, we should say, in view of the present state of the divorce question, ought not to be.

We are glad, the whole South is glad, that the bond of slavery is forever severed. But let there be fair dealing. Slavery was not all bad; indeed, there were beautiful features in it. Mrs. Stowe could see this with perfect distinctness. She says, speaking of Kentucky: "Whoever visits some estates there, and witnesses the good-humored indulgence of some masters and mistresses, and the affectionate loyalty of some slaves, might be tempted to dream the oft-fabled poetic legend of a patriarchal institution, and all that"; and it is not a little remarkable that the *but* she interposes is not founded upon personal abuses, but upon the abstract principle that the *law* regarded the slaves as *things*. But, while this was true by the theory of the law, a very different rule obtained in fact. The personal relationship was rarely forgotten, and that higher law which binds soul to soul found constant expression.

We venture to give an incident which will serve to illustrate this, in the case of a representative man—Leonidas Polk, Bishop of Louisiana. He had caused a negro man to be punished for stealing. A few days after, he discovered that he had been misled by false information, and that the man was really innocent. He could not undo the punishment, but there was something that he could do. He called the man a little apart in the woods and made him sit by him on a fallen tree. He told him that he had become convinced

that he had done him a great wrong, and that he had brought him there to tell him so, as his fellow man and brother before God. After he had explained how he had been misled, he said, "And now I want to tell you how sorry I am, and to beg your forgiveness"; and the strong, proud man bowed himself before the lowly son of toil, while with hand clasped in hand the slave and master wept together.

There was, indeed, a genuine affection and respect subsisting between the whites and blacks, almost universally, supported by that surest of all guarantees, mutual interests; and there was, therefore, the freest intercourse one with another. It was this phase, so hard for people who have never lived in the South to understand, which constantly presented itself, and caused true men—tender-hearted men—to conclude that, upon the whole, the best thing was to let it alone. And even now, glad as we are that, by the inscrutable hand of Providence, the whole business has been cleared away, if we held the mere *happiness* theory of life, we should seriously doubt if the negro as a class has been the gainer by the change. His life was so free from care, his wants so fully met, his affectionate nature so stimulated and sustained by his patriarchal surroundings, that, notwithstanding the abuses to which he was sometimes exposed, there is room to fear that freedom is proving a dear boon to him. There was, perhaps, no class of laborers in the world whose life exhibited more light-heartedness, or was more enlivened by merriment and jollity. Now, the cares which have come upon him, the constant strain to provide what before gave him no concern, the absence of the sure if not affectionate hands in sickness, are telling seriously upon him; and we may look almost in vain for the old songs and dances, the hearty laugh and ready jest.

But we do *not* hold that mere temporal happiness is the true end of man; and, therefore, we cheerfully concede that it is better that the negro should be called upon to try the higher and rougher path of personal responsibility. Many of the race have already reached a higher plane, and we trust, in God's name, that the whole race will rise to better things. But, if Mrs. Stowe were to draw a true picture of Southern life in the altered condition of affairs, she would be compelled to leave out much of the grotesque fun which made it possible for people to read the pathetic but frightful scenes she portrayed in her wonderful book; while, on the other hand, she would find room to add much in the way of individual enterprise and true manliness in the Southern freedman.

If we have succeeded in any manner in putting the true condition of the slaves before the reader, it will be perceived at once that the Southern clergyman could never, in the nature of things, have been indifferent to the religious education of the blacks. As a matter of fact, there was scarce any clergyman in the South whose work was not largely among the slaves. Not only was provision made for them in the churches where the white people worshiped, but they everywhere had churches of their own. By all odds, the largest churches in Richmond and New Orleans were for the negroes exclusively, and they everywhere had commodious buildings. They were served by white clergy, assisted by men of their own color.

In Tuscaloosa, for example, of which we happen to have some knowledge, the distinguished Dr. Summers had a large negro society belonging to his pastoral charge. This was in 1844, when it was still the capital of Alabama. He spent much time in training colored preachers, exhorters, and leaders among them. He had an immense Sunday-school, and among the teachers were Chief Justice Collier, afterward Governor of the State, Senators, and other distinguished citizens, assisted by accomplished ladies. All through the South there was work of a corresponding character.

The negro membership in the church was often equal, sometimes much beyond, the whites in numbers. As an example, in Charleston District, in the Methodist Church, as reported in 1828, there were three thousand four hundred and ninety-two whites, and five thousand nine hundred and seventy-seven colored.

Nor were the efforts to reach the black population confined to towns and cities. Regularly organized missions were established upon the plantations. The planters themselves applied for missionaries, and promoted their work. The honor, perhaps, of the first systematic work in this way is due to Dr. Capers, of South Carolina. In 1829 he established missions to the colored people exclusively on the Ashley and Santee Rivers. These rapidly spread until, before the war, plantation missions were coextensive with the South. Catechisms and other necessary books were printed and distributed by the hundreds of thousands. At the breaking out of the war the Methodist Church alone had more than two hundred thousand colored communicants, besides many thousands of catechumens and hearers.

The work of the Baptists was not at all behind that of the Methodists. Their missionaries were in every direction, and they num-

bered their followers by hundreds of thousands. All other Christian bodies were heartily engaged in this great work—the glory, we may say, of the South.

As an example of the sentiment and feeling on this subject in the Episcopal Church, we give an extract from a memoir of Bishop Elliott, published shortly after his death in 1866: "He was earnestly devoted to the duty of preaching the gospel to the negroes of his diocese. He summoned his whole people to the work, as the great mission to which they were called, the special field of Christian labor to which they were dedicated. Some of his most eloquent and impassioned addresses were devoted to this theme. He spoke often and plainly, earnestly and solemnly, on this subject. He held his people to a strict responsibility for the spiritual and eternal, as well as the physical and temporal, welfare of those over whom they ruled. He sent missionaries and established missions wherever he could. He led the way by his personal labors. He founded St. Stephen's Church for colored people in the city of Savannah. He placed its secular affairs under the charge of a colored vestry. They looked upon him as their firmest, wisest, and noblest friend. At his burial they gave a touching and beautiful evidence of the love and reverence they bore him. The colored vestry of St. Stephen's asked to have the honor of carrying him to the grave; and it was granted to them. It did honor to them and to their Bishop. Considering the peculiar and momentous issues of the time, we think it was the grandest and most instructive spectacle, amid all the solemn, mournful, and agitating ceremonies of that day, on which the city of Savannah was hushed to listen to the footfalls of those who thus bore their Bishop to the tomb."

The colored people of the South are not unmindful of the work done for them by the clergy in the days of slavery and since. From a remarkable speech made by the Rev. William D. Johnson, one of the fraternal delegates from the African Methodist Episcopal Church to the General Conference at Atlanta, in 1878, we make the following extract: "In the name of the African Methodist Episcopal Church—and I declare the true sentiments of thousands—I say that, for your Church and your race, we cherish the kindliest feelings that ever found lodgment in the human breast. Of this you need not be told. Let speak your former missionaries among us, who now hold seats upon this floor, and whose hearts have so often burned within them as they have seen the Word sown by them in such humble soil burst forth into abundant harvest. . . . It was as

one of the nations included in our Lord's inheritance that we were sent to you over two hundred years ago for instruction in the government of the Prince of Peace, that the little leaven might be hidden within the true and trusty hearts of the chosen representatives of a mighty race; and right well have you performed your duty. . . . Mr. Chairman, we can never forget the magnanimity of your organization to us in the dark days succeeding the close of the war—how your ministers recognized our divine commission, in many cases turning over to us the property as well as the people, with prayers and benedictions. We remember, also, how helpful have been the kind words you have spoken to us both in our pastorates and annual sessions; how, also, you have so cordially thrown open the doors of your metropolitan churches to our bishops and preachers, thus declaring in the midst of doubts and fears, no whit behind the chiefest, that character and ability, and not the mere accidents of color and clime, entitle mankind to respect. And to-day you have set the seal upon it."

We think it must be admitted that Mr. Swing is in error when he says that "the slave was too contemptible to merit any salvation"; and it may well be gathered, from what has been already said, that he is equally in error when he says, "The master was too great to need any."

See to what pitch his preconceived ideas of Southern society carried him: "Nero was so illustrious as emperor that he might carry on any form of revel or crime, and might put out of the way his own mother if she gave signs of living too long, or was too full of personal thought and opinion. The planter was some such a piece of human absolutism, and did not need much rebuke for sins, nor much instruction in the line of common morals, inasmuch as his position in society made him a natural heir of the good things of the two worlds."

Now, whatever fault the Southern pulpit had before the war, it was not cowardly and skulking. Earnestness and directness have always been its special characteristics. The duties and responsibilities of masters necessarily occupied the fore-front as a theme. Can any man in his senses dream that the work which we have seen among the slaves could have been accomplished without the active coöperation of the planters? The pulpit did not let them forget that their people had souls, and that they would have to answer in their own souls for the results of their action toward them. As an example, take this from a series of letters, published in a New Or-

leans paper, by Bishop Andrew, in 1856. Speaking of the master's responsibilities with regard to the religious instruction of his slaves, he says: "I will suppose you feed them well and clothe them well, and lodge them comfortably; and all that is very well. But this is not enough. Do you not bestow the same care upon your mules? Believe me, though you may ignore this, God will remember it; and, if you neglect your duty in the premises, your remembrance of it in coming time will be bitter. You can not—no, you can not neglect your duty on this subject, and escape. God has a thousand ways even here to bring home the curse of disobedience to you, in your soul and body, in your habitation, in your children; and this curse has very often fallen upon the transgressor in this world. The chain of connection, it may be, has not been noticed; but the woe, the bitter curse, the ruin, has been patent to everybody. But even supposing no such curse to manifest itself here, the day that cometh shall reveal it. The careless master and the neglected slave shall meet and confront each other face to face, and the recollections of that day shall bring out your mutual delinquencies, with the motives, ends, and aims which have actuated you in every instance. Thoughtless, prayerless, godless master, you will, you must meet this responsibility!"

Let any one glance over a little book on the "Duties of Christian Masters," originally written for a prize offered by the Baptist Convention of Alabama, by Dr. (now Bishop) McTyeire, and he will certainly see that there was no effort to spare or shield the slaveholder. Public sentiment everywhere expected and supported the most direct and personal appeals in this matter. A cowardly, fawning parson could not be tolerated in a region where bluntness and plain speaking was the rule.

The clergy insisted that the planters should provide proper church accommodations for their people, and that they should not be compelled to use the barn, the cotton-shed, or the sugar-house for religious purposes. It was urged that these had too many work-day associations, and that servants should not be led to look upon the minister as a part of the plantation police. We remember an incident which shows that the clergy were not easily put off with "anything that would do" in this regard. A Bishop of one of the Gulf dioceses had brought a rich planter to build a church for his people. When the Bishop came to see it he was much displeased at the shabby way in which it had been put up. The planter asked him how he liked it. "I don't like it at all," was the reply; "it is

more like a stable than a church." "Oh," said the planter, "it is good enough for niggers!" The Bishop turned upon him with a look that pierced him through, and replied, "We do not build churches for 'niggers,' we build them for the glory of God!" After the planter had recovered his breath, he ventured to ask, in a humble voice, "Well, Bishop, what shall we name the church?" The indignation of the Bishop was too great to be appeased in a moment, and he said: "Name it? I don't know, unless we call it the Church of the Holy *Manger*."

The census of 1850 shows that out of the whole Church accommodations in the United States, of Methodists, nearly one half were in the slave States; of Baptists, about four sevenths; Presbyterians, about one third; Roman Catholic, one fourth; and Episcopal, about two fifths. Of these accommodations fully one half were for the colored people.

We hazard little in saying that in no part of the country is what is technically called "the cloth" more respected than in the South. The roughest and most godless, as well as the most refined and cultured, have always shown the clergyman the profoundest deference, because he was a clergyman. It was a part of the old social code, and many instances might be related to show it in men of the highest distinction—men like Henry Clay and Andrew Jackson. We venture to give an example from the rougher side of humanity in that rugged, rousing character, Sam Houston. He was, at the time, President of the Republic of Texas, and was traveling on a steamboat, talking and swearing vehemently. One of the company saw Dr. Summers, who was then a missionary in Texas, standing within ear-shot. He called the Texan President's attention to the fact. Old Sam turned at once, and, walking up to the missionary with ceremonious bow, said: "I beg your pardon, Mr. Summers, I beg your pardon, sir; I was very much excited, and my language was very unbecoming." "Yes, sir," replied the other, "very unbecoming so distinguished a man." The next Sunday Mr. Summers preached, and General Houston and other dignitaries of the republic were present. His sermon was on public vices; and he treated the subject in no mincing way. After it was over, one of the General's suite, in view of the occurrence of the previous day, began to assure him that the preacher could not have meant anything personal to his Excellency. The reply was: "He did just right—just right, sir; it is the business of the pulpit to be outspoken, whoever it may hit."

Of the third and last charge which Mr. Swing brings to support his unwarrantable hypothesis, namely, that the Southern pulpit has always been too (what is called) "orthodox," it will not be necessary to say much. The South has ever had a *whole* Bible, and has too well understood the doctrine of the Incarnation—the indissoluble union of our humanity with the Divinity in the person of the "Man of Sorrows"—ever to forget that the temporal and eternal must go together. If her pulpit has, therefore, ever pointed to heaven, it has never forgotten that "that was not first which is spiritual but that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual." Her clergy have faithfully preached the two tables of the law and of the gospel—the love of God and the love of man. They have not known—we are happy to think they do not yet know—a better gospel. That in accordance with this they have not failed to preach of life and manners, must sufficiently appear from what has gone before. We submit that in no part of the world has the truth been more clearly seen or more faithfully taught that "a twofold world must go to a perfect cosmos—natural things and spiritual."

We have no purpose or desire to institute comparisons; but, if our voice could be heard, we would fain warn certain of our brethren in the North lest they "put asunder what God hath joined together," in their intense effort at the sensational and temporal.

A word seems to be required upon the attitude of the pulpit in the South upon the subject of slavery before the war. We do not know how to set this forth better than by quoting from the action of the South Carolina Conference as early as 1836. They say:

"We regard the question of the abolition of slavery as a *civil* one, belonging to the State, and not at all a religious one, or appropriate to the Church—though we do hold that abuses which may sometimes happen, such as excessive labor, extreme punishment, withholding necessary food and clothing, neglect in sickness or old age, and the like, are immoralities, to be prevented or punished by all proper means, both of Church discipline and civil law, each in its place."

In this regard, we submit that the Southern clergy stood just where the early Church and the Church throughout the world stood through so many ages. The canons of council after council could be quoted to this end, if space and the occasion warranted. We are amazed that there can be any difference of opinion upon this point. It was the position of St. Paul in sending Onesimus—a Christian, but a white slave—back from Rome to his Christian

master at Colosse. Let us take the words of one of the greatest modern authorities in England, Bishop Wordsworth, speaking upon this point. He says: "The Divine Founder did not tempt the vast multitude of slaves, with which the Roman Empire then swarmed, to receive the gospel by promising them liberty. He canceled no existing rights, but Christianized them all. He broke no bonds of service, but he dignified and hallowed them. He addresses the slave by the voice of St. Paul: 'Art thou called, being a slave?' (Art thou baptized into Christ being a bondsman?) 'Care not for it' (let not thy slavery afflict thee). 'Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called. But if thou mayest be free, use it rather'; that is, seize not liberty with force, but embrace it with joy. By the mouth of St. Paul, our Lord reproved those false teachers who excited the passions of slaves, and drew them to themselves, by promising them freedom. 'Let slaves count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed, and they that have Christian masters let them not despise them because they are brethren; but rather do them service because they are brethren beloved.' Thus he dignified the service of the slave."

And now are the Southern clergy to be accused and contemned because they did not violate the teachings of the apostles and the Primitive church, as well as the example of the Divine Master?

But it is all over, and we say again, we are thankful. All we ask is, that our brethren of the North may try to understand us better. If Mr. Swing would only come and live among the Southern people, he would learn how impossible such things as he thinks really were. The Southern people believe in—have the liveliest interest in—the General Government. They have no dream or hope in any possible prosperity but through the Union wisely administered. The South, of all other sections, believes in it with all her soul and strength—wrought in her, let it be granted, by a bitter experience. But we think it sound theology that there can be no repentance when there has been no consciousness of sin. The South may have been wrong in the war, as she certainly was unfortunate; but it was not a conscious wrong, and why, therefore, should she be called to repentance? No, she may regret, but she can never have a feeling of remorse; nor, while she thankfully recognizes that the Almighty had in store for her better things than she knew, she does not feel called upon to forsake the memory of her glorious dead, nor contemn that sad story of disappointed

hopes. Integrity of action can have no fellowship with shame and confusion of face.

Glorious things are in store for our Southern land. The harvest is not yet; but if the seed so plentifully sown—the dearest blood of a people—be any augury of future yield, there shall be a mighty ingathering in the end. What generous heart can blame her, even now, if she look back into the past with proud satisfaction? Already Time begins to throw his mellow tints upon past terrors. The tramp of many feet, the hearty cheers, the rattle of musketry, the impetuous charge, the dull booming of far-off guns, the groans of dying men—all come back blended and shadowy, like the scenes in an old romance. Ah! who does not still behold those glorious legions, silent and shadowy, as they march forth in "war's magnificently stern array"? Has any ever charged that they fought not as men who believed their quarrel just, or that they threw down their arms ere the day was lost? But, having failed, they yielded in good faith, saving honor always. Yes, they failed, and yet failed never that brilliant heroism—that patient endurance—that pure devotion, which elevates and expands humanity. None may yet measure the reward of the heroic dead, nor balance the pain of a mother's heart, riven with anguish for her fair-faced boy who came not home again. Deep has been the suffering; but it is the inexorable law of progress. There is a mighty Hand which gathers the little and the great. Never do the actors at any stage of the world's progress know the results to be attained through their trials or triumphs. What great ends in government, in chivalry, in religion, shall be wrought out for our united land through the glory and the suffering of the late war, none may yet presume to say; but let us not doubt that in time to come the philosopher and historian shall point to those terrific scenes and cry, "Behold the fruit!" And then, when mercy and truth have met together, then shall the glorious story of the heroic deeds of the soldier in gray, as well as in blue, cause the hearts of the brave and good in all lands to thrill with generous admiration and applause.

F. A. Shoup.

CASTE AT WEST POINT.

One of the strangest phenomena of modern times is the fact that *character*, whether of individuals or institutions, offers no barrier to the immediate assaults of a free press. If the worst aspect is not at once accepted, at least the evil suspicion lingers and grows by constant reiteration; and, were it not for the sober second thought, guided and controlled by reason, trust and confidence in all things might readily be destroyed by unscrupulous partisans.

We have had a remarkable instance of this irresponsible power of the press, in its ability for a time to strike down to the dust an institution that has for eighty years contributed so largely to the glory of our country. An institution, like an individual, has a character and a personality. Affections emanate from the individual which are manifested in acts, and modify the aggregate good or evil of the community. From an institution individual actors go out, each typical of the good or evil influence exerted by it.

If the public press be correct in its interpretation, then is West Point no longer an institution of thorough education, manly qualities, or devoted duty, but a hot-bed of aristocracy, of caste, of outrage, and insurrection. Is it possible that this change in its nature should be so sudden, so complete, so radical, and yet not be apparent to those who are charged with its administration?

General Scott, although not a graduate, has said: "I give it as my fixed opinion that, but for our graduated cadets, the war between the United States and Mexico might, and probably would, have lasted some four or five years, with, in its first half, more defeats than victories falling to our share; whereas, in less than two campaigns, we conquered a great peace without the loss of a single battle or skirmish."

The records of both sides of the civil war attest the continuance of this professional ability. Millions of the public money are yearly appropriated, to be disbursed under the direction of the graduates of the Military Academy, by distinct Congressional enactment.

Besides the 829 officers in the service, many more are engaged in the various professions of civil life, of whom it may truly be said that every quality that guarantees to men the admiration of their fellows and the respect and gratitude of the community, has adorned their public and private lives.

The wisdom of Washington led to the foundation of the Academy. Nature and art have united in making this favored spot perfect in its scenery, its surroundings, and appointments. But neither buildings nor surroundings are the essentials of an institution of learning. The inherent qualities of truth and justice must mold its character, shape its actions, and define its destiny. Previous to 1819 the Academy was but a simple school of practice and of learning. Subsequently General Thayer, with a far-reaching purpose, a strong will, and a comprehensive understanding of its necessities, gave it the vitality which has enabled it to pass from healthy childhood to vigorous manhood.

This nation is preëminently a people of peaceful pursuits. With the highest possible belief in our destiny, and with an indifference to the lessons of history, we trust to Providence for the future, believing that in our emergency the God of battles will see us safely through. A few far-seeing statesmen have, however, advocated the establishment by law of this Military Academy, and the maintenance of a small regular army, in order to keep active the study of the military art, and to have something at least to rely upon in time of war. The appropriation of the necessary funds for the education of the fifty cadets (one to each million inhabitants) annually sent out from the Academy, is attended by vigorous debates in Congress, a masterly conflict of personal animosities, and much greater legislative efforts than when vastly greater sums are appropriated for the improvement of a few small creeks. But the results of the Academy and the deeds of the army are a sufficient answer to any question of the value of either.

How are the young men, who are gathered here from all parts of the country, trained and made competent to perform their duties as officers in the army of the United States?

Congress has enacted that candidates for admission into the Military Academy shall be selected from each Congressional district; shall be between seventeen and twenty-two years of age, of healthy *physique*, and have sufficient mental capacity to pass an examination in United States history, geography, English grammar, reading, writing and orthography, and arithmetic. In these days

of universal education no class of people, nor any section of the country, can be barred by these simple requirements from its benefits. Congress has not pretended heretofore to determine either the social status or the religious belief of the eligible candidates. The latter, having reached the age of young manhood, are presumed to reflect the social feelings, sentiments, and beliefs of the communities which they represent. Statistics show that at present about 39 per cent. appointed fail to pass the preliminary examination, and among these are found many who give vent to their disappointment by abusing the Academy in its extremity, whose requirements are *so severe* as to prevent their admission.

The method of instruction can be characterized by a single word —*thoroughness* in every branch, whether drill, discipline, or study. The work is laborious, systematic, ceaseless. The scope of instruction is limited to the few branches of study that are presumed to give the best possible education for the end in view. Efficiency is attained in drill by constant practice. The times allotted for this part of the training are so arranged as to make the drill act as recreation to body and mind after the latter has been employed in the severest mental labor. A healthy body, with a vigorous constitution and fine physical development, is thus attained and becomes the abiding-place of a strong and progressive intellect. Not to every one are these gifts given in the same measure; but to each his own, determined by his natural talents, capacity, and special peculiarity.

Statistics show that 61 per cent. of those who enter, or 38 per cent. of those appointed, succeed now in graduating—a larger proportion than ever before.

I believe that the system of education here employed is the best that can be devised for the purpose. In what does education consist? Certainly, not wholly in the acquisition of knowledge during the formative period of youth. Of what intrinsic value are the facts of knowledge obtained while in college or academy? Education is essentially mental and moral discipline, continued consistently and consecutively during a reasonably definite period of time when the rational and emotional faculties have their most rapid development. Now, we get this discipline at the Military Academy by the *culture and practice of truth*, and by *requiring and obtaining* a definite number of hours of *hard study* on each specified task. We are assured that this mental labor has been expended by a close and thorough examination of each cadet at every recitation.

It is my pleasure to make yearly visits to some of the more prominent colleges of the country, and I have never heard recitations that will even fairly compare with those that are daily made here. My personal experience and conclusions based upon it have been confirmed by many eminent professors, who have expressed to me their gratification at the thorough work done by our cadets.

The course of studies comprises briefly :

1. *Pure mathematics*, embracing algebra, geometry, trigonometry, analytical and descriptive geometry and the calculus. These are designed to develop the reasoning powers and to lay a foundation for the sciences which form a large part of the military art.

2. *Physics*, comprising analytical mechanics, principles of molecular science, heat, sound, light, astronomy, chemistry, mineralogy, and geology. These are to some extent supplemented by practical applications, and are the natural sequence of the mathematical studies.

3. *Languages*, embodying English grammar, rhetoric, and composition, French, and Spanish. These are studied during the first two years (except Spanish, which comes during the last year of the course), in order to enable the cadet to understand the structure of his own language, to express his thoughts and observations with clearness and brevity, and to place within his reach literature largely connected with his profession. Spanish is deemed a necessary acquisition, because of the near presence of Spanish-speaking people, on the Mexican frontier, in the West Indies, and South America.

4. *Professional studies*, which comprise the minor tactics of the three arms of the service, ordnance and gunnery, topographical and free-hand drawing, international, constitutional, and military law, strategy, grand tactics, the art of war, civil and military engineering.

The resident faculty of the Academy are but eight in number, but they have had, with few exceptions, not only varied experience in the art of instruction, but have been themselves actors in the great war through which this country has but recently passed, and their united judgment as to the utility and proper relations of such a course is entitled to respect and confidence.

This is, however, but a part of a cadet's education. Intellectually, our graduates have been able to hold a respectable place in the nation. What is their reputation as men of probity and general morality? Well, fortunately we have history to speak for us. General George W. Cullum has, in the midst of professional duties of no little magnitude, compiled the record of *every* graduate of the

Academy. In three large volumes will be found the name, the services, the fate, of every one of its graduated pupils, from 1802 to July 1, 1878. The total number to July 1, 1879, is 2,826. Of this number, but thirty-eight have been finally dismissed for cause (exclusive of sympathy with the rebellion), or but little more than one per cent. of the whole, as follows :

For drunkenness	10
For causes not specified	10
For neglect of duty and conduct unbecoming an officer and gentleman	8
For having failed to render accounts	6
For misapplication of public funds	3
For cowardice	1

This record and these cases extend over a period of nearly eighty years ; and, while it would be a matter of just pride to ourselves and the country to have the above a blank, it is, as it stands, a most gratifying record. Can any profession, even the ministry, whose members are so far removed from temptation, exemplify in so striking a manner the existence and real presence of the qualities that ennoble mankind ?

Now, an institution that lays bare its inmost nature to so close a public inspection can demand a suspension of judgment when assailed even in the Senate of the United States. There is no warrant for its immediate condemnation; and we, who know the nature of its teachings and the moral growth of its pupils, are in duty bound to express our trust, confidence, and steadfast belief in its good name and honor, and shall, while these remain, be its defenders.

Even in a Christian sect, which has established its code of morals and of conduct, by the violation of which sympathy and companionship cease, there are certain minor departures from the standard which do not necessarily involve complete or even partial severance of the ties of brotherhood. Men join the church, and still continue in active competitive business. Some still edit newspapers, others watch the rise and fall of stocks ; yet all are in good church standing. But there are other acts and other business which, being done, shut the door.

The one sure, strong safeguard of the Military Academy is the degree in which its pupils hold sacred their word of honor. *They will not lie nor steal.* He who is guilty of either of these violations of the moral code is for ever an outcast. Now, history teaches that, when in a community the vital principle of truth can reach down into and lay hold of the springs of human action, that community will

do right and grow in power and wisdom. Especially is this true of an army that may in times of trouble hold in its hands the liberties of a people. Without truth and honor, the army is a festering sore, a spreading corruption. The graduates of West Point can point with just pride to their individual and united histories and await the severest inspection.

How have they behaved in time of war? Two hundred and forty-seven killed in battle is the answer. Many more stricken down with disease or wounds received in the line of duty. With scarcely ten years of war in the aggregate, this roll intensifies the well-merited approbation of General Scott. How have they performed their duties in times of so-called peace? The stories of arduous campaigns against hostile tribes in the intensest heat of summer, and terrible storms of winter; the survey of vast domains, the construction of public works, the improvement of rivers and harbors, the faithful expenditure of the public money, without a dollar sticking to their fingers, attest both their ability and their conscientious devotion to duty, to honor, and to the highest morality.

Can it be possible that these facts are unknown to our people? Has it come to this, that so faithful a body of men, of whom the country should be proud, must, at the intemperate outcry of a partisan press, be compelled to speak of their character and deeds in self-defense?

Having briefly touched upon the main characteristics of the Academy, I now come to the question of caste. There are many people who delight in prescribing rules of life and conduct for their neighbors, but who take good care to follow their own inclinations for themselves. I have had an intimate acquaintance with the Academy for seventeen years in my relations as cadet, officer, and professor. I therefore speak from personal knowledge, and say that there is neither caste nor aristocracy now, and never has been, among the cadets. Men arrange themselves here, as elsewhere, by sympathy, by similarity of tastes, by ability, intelligence, and aptitude in their profession. I have known the son of a poor Irish laborer take and keep the head of his class, gain the love and friendship of his comrades, and, when he fell at the head of his regiment at Gettysburg, his death was mourned with as sincere sorrow as that felt among brothers of one family. The sons of the poor and the rich, of the influential and the obscure, of the educated and the uncultured, mingle together and take a rank due alone to their mental and moral natures, irrespective of their antecedent accidents of birth, wealth, or social condition.

But, in 1870, a representative of the people, as was his right, sent to the Academy a young colored man to enter as a cadet. Whether it was wise to endeavor to solve the problem of the social equality of the races at that time and at this place was not a question for the authorities of West Point to discuss. They were the servants of the people, and the letter of appointment of new Cadet Smith was as valid a document as that of any other appointee, and entitled him to equally respectful treatment. But, in the light of events, if this problem was to be solved in the completest manner, a decent representative of the colored race, who united in himself at least average ability with agreeable manners, should have been selected. The young man in question was in disposition irascible, easily provoked, and vindictive. From certain facts I believe that these qualities were developed by other influences exterior to the Academy. His ability was not sufficient for his successful passing the requirements of the Academy. As he was for the last year of his stay under my personal supervision and instruction, I speak from personal knowledge. I was anxious for his success, and did all that was possible to make his success assured. I have now before me a complete record of his daily work. Briefly I may state that on the 25th of October, 1873, his class rank was forty-one out of forty-six, and at the close of the January examination became forty-five. During the next session his deficiencies became so apparent that, even with the greatest allowances in his favor, he fell with two of his white classmates below the line of proficiency, and all were accordingly dropped. One of these was the son of a distinguished officer of the army, still in the service, and, if even sympathy for the heroic deeds of a veteran could have influenced the Academic board, his son would have passed. But the records of that board show that its decisions are rendered with a judicial fairness and impartiality as perfect as human nature usually dictates.

As regards the personal relations of Cadet Smith with his comrades, a perusal of the record of his violation of regulations shows that he came prepared to make trouble. He was not slow to take offense even where none was intended. His conduct and manners were such that the isolation that was his lot would have been the fate of any white cadet under similar circumstances. But because of the peculiar status of Cadet Smith his grievances were largely magnified, were reported by him to the authorities, and resulted in severer punishment to those of his comrades who were so unfortunate as to be brought into relations with him.

As a natural sequence, every possibility of annoyance was carefully avoided, and his isolation during release from duty was complete.

Since 1870 at least ten colored cadets have been appointed to West Point, of which number seven succeeded in passing the preliminary examination. Of these only four remained one year, three till the close of the third year, and one has graduated. They have all displayed a marked deficiency in deductive reasoning, and have taken very low rank in mathematical subjects, but generally possess excellent memories.

Having indicated the origin, in part, of colored Cadet Smith's isolation, I may add the statement that this lack of personal association was extended to all of his color who succeeded him; and while there were and are now many cadets who have no pronounced prejudice on the question of color, *the fact* that, in any altercation where a colored cadet was a party, punishment of the white cadet was more certain, more severe and speedy, was the real origin of this separation of the races. Other cadets often settled their personal difficulties in the old-fashioned way, and the authorities never officially heard of them. The isolation, which, however, had nothing of hatred in it, had really commenced to decline, as is clearly shown in the late investigation, where the human sympathy existing in the hearts of Cadets Peck, Catlin, and others had been expressed to colored Cadet Whittaker.

Now, it ought to be remembered, to the credit of the corps of cadets, that in no case has there ever been the slightest indignity ever offered to their colored companions. They have neither been "hazed" nor "deviled." Being without the pale of social recognition, they have likewise been exempt from all possible annoyance. No man of right feeling can commend any conduct that is not in accord with the golden rule; but we have no right to expect in this transition period any higher standard of conduct, with respect to an almost *universal prejudice*, among the young than is exhibited and inculcated by their parents, relations, and friends. There is a vast difference between a moral precept in the abstract and its practical operation in the daily life, and generally we find that those who complain the most loudly are apt to be the farthest in the rear with respect to the question at issue. Let the authorities send here some young colored men who in ability are at least equal to the average white cadet, and possessed of manly qualities, and no matter how dark be the color of the skin, they will settle the question here as it

must be settled in the country at large, on the basis of human intelligence and human sympathy.

Cadet Whittaker is the third of his race that has advanced to the close of the third year of the course. Competing with his classmates, he was transferred on the 13th of March to the last section of his class, in the most important of his present studies. On the 6th of April the country was startled by a tale of outrage upon him, which, if true, should have awakened the just indignation of the people, and be followed by the speedy condemnation of the Academy. But the story was far from the truth ; and, while it would be wrong to express any decided opinion on the merits of the case while the court of inquiry is engaged in its thorough investigation, it seems to me proper to correct the erroneous views which have been derived from the current sensational stories of the day.

1. *His wounds.* They are now entirely healed, and are not noticeable except upon close inspection. When fresh they were five in number. *First*, in order of magnitude, was a *flesh* cut on the lobe of the right ear below the gristle, one eighth of an inch deep at the deepest part ; it is neither a notch nor a slit, but a cut. *Second*, the *slightest* portion of the *extreme* edge of the *lower tip* was cut off of the left ear. *Third*, the most superficial cut (not deeper than a pin-scratch), on the back of the left hand, that it is possible to make with the point of a knife or sharp cutting instrument. *Fourth* and *fifth*, two very superficial parallel cuts, about five eighths of an inch in length, on the top of the little toe of his left foot.

2. *His condition when found.* His pulse, respiration, and temperature were normal. He readily returned to wakefulness and was fit for his accustomed academic duty shortly after breakfast the same morning. He had no contusion, abrasion, or evidence of a blow upon his person ; no blood below his nostril, to indicate bleeding of the nose, and none of the symptoms indicated in medical works which accompany restoration from unconsciousness.

3. *His previous treatment.* On the part of the Superintendent, professors, instructors, and officers at the Academy, and by the authorities at Washington, he had received, because of his color, marked advantages, beyond those usually extended to his white comrades, and to which he now owes his position as a cadet. His comrades have in a very few instances spoken words of encouragement to him, one has visited him in a friendly way in his room, but the large majority of his class have not sought nor invited social intercourse with him. (Social intimacies are usually confined to

classes, rarely until the last year going outside of them.) All cadets (with two exceptions) have refrained, in the most scrupulous manner, from even the slightest insult, indignity, hazing, or objectionable conduct toward him. One of the exceptions occurred nearly four years ago, when the offending cadet under some provocation struck him a blow, but was by sentence of court-martial promptly dismissed. Nothing in his daily recitations indicated any gloom or despondency. He has been attentive, unassuming, and irreproachable in his conduct.

Every cadet, in the most solemn manner, and under oath, has testified to absolute ignorance in regard to the alleged assault or note of warning; and, while it is barely possible that, among a body of two hundred and eighty young men gathered from all parts of the country, there might be three such inhuman wretches who, if guilty of such an outrage, would perjure themselves, it is not possible, from the intimate relations they bear to each other in their pursuits and habits of life, to keep such a secret so closely guarded from at least the suspicion of one honorable man. I personally believe them to be truthful men and that they have neither lied, prevaricated, nor concealed anything connected with this affair.

The court is composed of officers of experience, of honor, of integrity and probity, and the country can afford to await the result of its findings. Cadet Whittaker is represented by his counsel, an officer whose judgment, ability, and perfect belief in his innocence are unquestioned, while he himself is left free to attend to his academic duties, the performance of which is absolutely necessary for his complete success at the coming examination.

The bodily injury to Cadet Whittaker is practically nothing, but the Academy has received wounds which are still fresh and bleeding. All are fully agreed that it is absolutely necessary, for the honor of the Academy, that the authors of this outrage should be discovered and summarily dealt with. Whatever may be the result, I believe that the Academy has not received justice. It has been condemned unheard. Its past history, its glorious record, its sturdy uprightness, have availed nothing against the fury of popular passion, unduly excited by the dissemination of glaring falsehoods. But we, who know its true character and believe in its noble mission, can not doubt that the institution which has never yet failed to meet the utmost demands of the people, in times of real trial and danger, will again assert the value of established character and of devotion to the truth.

PETER S. MICHIE.

SOME INTERESTING PUBLICATIONS.

I. Italy and her Invaders.
II. Romances of the Middle Ages.
III. Chaldean Legends of Genesis.
IV. Explorations in Cambodia.

I.

THERE is, at least, one part of Gibbon's "History" which, thanks to the labors of German and French students, may profitably be rewritten, and that is the chapters which portray the transformation of Western Europe by the settlement and interfusion of the Teutonic races. With one exception, which requires distinct and careful treatment, the miscalled barbarians, who successively occupied the provinces of the Western Roman Empire, performed a colonizing and conservative rather than a destructive and disintegrating function. Just what they found in the Roman land, what they brought thither, and how much remained upstanding, after their permanent lodgment in the soil — these are all questions about which much more information is now accessible than was forthcoming a century ago. An effort to sum up for English readers the latest results of critical and archæological investigation in this interesting field of inquiry has been made by Mr. Thomas Hodgkin,* of University College, London, in a work of which the first two volumes are now published. The first of these deals with the circumstances and consequences of the Visigothic irruption, the second with the Hunnish and Vandal invasions; and the author proposes in subsequent volumes to treat with equal completeness the movements of the Franks, Burgundians, Ostrogoths, and Lombards, bringing down his survey of the mutilated and remodeled but by no means extinguished Roman world to the threshold of the Carlovingian epoch. The writer does not profess to have prosecuted independent research in any direction; but he evinces, on the

* Italy and her Invaders, by Thomas Hodgkin, B. A. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

whole, a thorough acquaintance with what has been accomplished by German specialists and by such French historians as Thierry, Guizot, Sismondi, and Henri Martin, who have given much attention to the condition of Western Europe in the fifth and sixth centuries of our era.

We have been particularly impressed by the clearness with which Mr. Hodgkin discriminates the peril to which civilization was exposed by the assaults of the Huns from the relatively slight and transient harm inflicted by German invaders. We do not concur with him in thinking the battle between Aetius and Attila one of the decisive battles of the world; for the empire of the Hunnish chief, like that of Napoleon, to which it offers a rude parallel, had no elements of cohesion, and must in any case have been broken up upon the death of its creator. The army which fought for Attila near Troyes, like that which followed Napoleon to Russia, was largely made up of auxiliaries, and the number of Mongol warriors seems to have been relatively inconsiderable. The real danger was, not that the Mongol marauders might, under any circumstances, maintain themselves as a permanent incubus on a civilization which they, unlike the Visigoths, could never assimilate; but that Attila might push his work of destruction so far that scarcely anything would be left to be assimilated. From his later treatment of Aquileia, Padua, and other cities of northeast Italy, and from the havoc he had wrought on the left bank of the Rhine before his encounter with Aetius, we can see that his defeat was a question of life or death for the Roman provincials of southern Gaul, which at this time was as truly a focus of culture and refinement as was any part of the Italian Peninsula. It was not, however, the so-called battle of Chalons, but the premature death of the Hunnish chief, which saved the whole fabric of Roman society, as is sufficiently attested by his success in the following campaign. Had Attila lived a quarter of a century longer, as but for his drunken habits there is little reason to doubt he would have done, he would probably have swept away the accumulated treasures of Latin thought and law by the simple process of leveling their repositories, the great cities, to the ground. His death, however, as we have said, owing to the nature of his empire and the numerical weakness of the Mongol emigration, would have been followed, however, by much the same parcellation of the West among the Teutonic nations as did in fact occur, with this difference, that there would have been incomparably less material of value to be divided.

Mr. Hodgkin points out a number of errors and fables regarding the Hunnish invasion, which are still popularly current though they have been long rejected by scholars. Among these may be mentioned the story that Attila was murdered by a concubine, the truth being that he was subject to profuse bleeding at the nose, and that, one of these attacks occurring while he lay on his back in a drunken sleep, he was simply choked to death. A geographical misconception, which has been thoroughly exploded, is involved in the popular appellation of the great fight between the Roman provincials and their Visigothic allies, on the one hand, and the composite host of Attila on the other. What is known as the battle of Chalons might much more aptly be termed the battle of Troyes, since the contest took place some fifty miles from the former town, and at no great distance from the latter. According to the most nearly contemporary authority which offers any definite information at all, the battle was fought at the fifth milestone from Troyes, at a place called Maurica, in Champagne. The conclusion that the famous conflict must be referred to a point two days' march from the modern Chalons-sur-Marne, is reached by an examination of the language of the chroniclers, and is wholly independent of the curious discoveries made at Méry-sur-Seine, in which some eminent French antiquaries have recognized the remains of the Visigothic king, Theodoric, who fell in the battle. Among other current mistakes noticed by Mr. Hodgkin, is the story that Venice was founded by fugitives from Aquileia and other Roman cities destroyed during Attila's invasion. He shows that this story rests on mere tradition, and that other legends cited in popular histories, like Daru's for example, and which assign an even earlier date to that event, are equally apocryphal. After a careful scrutiny of the existing testimony on the subject, Mr. Hodgkin reaches the conclusion that the oldest authentic monument of the history of Venice carries us no further back than the early part of the sixth century.

We observe that Mr. Hodgkin accepts the hypothesis put forth by Deguignes more than a century ago, and which has been rather fortified than weakened by the researches of later sinologues. In other words, he identifies the Huns who appear in Dacia, toward the close of the fourth century, and who virtually vanish from the history of Europe after the death of Attila, with the Hiong-Nu, or inhabitants of what we now call Mongolia. The identification seems to be sufficiently made out by the statements of trustworthy

Chinese historians, but the author has overlooked the cumulative testimony recently supplied by Colonel Prejevalski, whose account of the physical aspect, character, social institutions, usages, and manners of the Mongols of our day, presents the most extraordinary series of correspondences to the description of the Huns contained in the text of Priscus and Jornandes. There is no doubt that the Hiong-Nu, or Mongols, had been most dangerous neighbors to China during the loosely organized feudal rule of the Kau or Chow dynasty, and that the Great Wall was built at an epoch roughly corresponding with the epoch of Hannibal, to check their inroads. The tide turned, however, after the consolidation of the Middle Kingdom under the Tsin and the Han dynasties, and the Mongol confederacy was first ruptured and then crushed by the armies of the centralized empire. The process, however, was a long one, and was not concluded until the close of the first century of our era, when the Chinese forces, assisted by Mantchoo auxiliaries, overflowed Mongolia like a torrent. Great multitudes of the Hiong-Nu consented to pass under the yoke and to change their name, but the rest fled westward, precisely as another Tartar tribe was to do sixteen centuries later, and settled by the Ural River near the modern Russian government of Orenburg. It was not till some three hundred years afterward that the Huns, during the reign of Valens, crossed the Volga and fell upon the Goths in Dacia. This long interval of quiescence and of obscurity is the weak place in the identification of the Hiong-Nu and the Huns; but, by scattered allusions in the Chinese historians, we are enabled dimly, and at long intervals, to trace the continued existence of a Hiong-Nu people along the line of the Volga and the northern shores of the Caspian. For a long time, doubtless, the eyes of the exiles would be turned eastward, and this lingering hope of regaining their old seats, and the reality of Alan resistance on the west, which long presented a formidable barrier, were probably two reasons for the long tarrying of the Hiong-Nu eastward of the Volga. A third was the utterly broken and dispirited state of the Hiong-Nu emigrants, whose political unity and organization were temporarily destroyed; and a fourth cause unquestionably was the prestige, slowly and with difficulty impaired, of that great state, known to the Chinese and their neighbors as Ta-Tsin (Great as China), of that Roman Empire which Marcus Aurelius and his immediate predecessors had ruled so wisely and made so strong. At all events, it was not until half a century after the irruption of the

Huns into Dacia that they began to exercise much direct influence on the course of Roman history. Indeed, the creation of their empire was the work of one man, whose organizing capacity amounted to positive genius. Mr. Hodgkin thinks that the extent of Attila's power has been under-estimated by modern historians, and he adduces considerable evidence for the belief that he had mastered Denmark and the coast of the Scandinavian Peninsula before assailing the Roman dominions. It is certainly a suggestive fact that Attila's movements in the north should have coincided with the wholesale migration to Britain of the Jutes, who had previously confined themselves to piratical excursions. Moreover, in the great army massed against Attila in the Catalaunian plains, figures a contingent of Saxons who seem to have been settled about the mouths of the Seine, whither they had lately migrated from the mouths of the Weser and the Elbe. But the explanation of their identification with the Neustrian seacoast by the contemparary chroniclers is involved in much obscurity.

As regards the causes assigned for the ruin of the Western Roman Empire, Mr. Hodgkin concurs with Gibbon in ranking Christianity among the potent solvents of the political fabric. He sees an incurable opposition between the Christian teaching and the root idea of the Roman commonwealth, and he thinks the wisest emperors were impelled to the most strenuous persecution by an intuitive perception that here was a religion which would have all or nothing, and which must be hunted into the Catacombs if they would bar it from the throne. To the question whether the Rome of the Fabii and the Scipios, the Rome which worshiped and believed in Jupiter and Quirinus, Mavors, Ops, and Saturnus, would have fallen as the Christian Rome fell before the hordes of Alaric, the author considers himself bound in his historical conscience to answer "No."

II.

THE deeds of Attila, whose precise historical outline is traced in the volumes above noticed, made an indelible mark on the imagination of three races of men—the Latin, the German, and the Scandinavian peoples—and in the ages of darkness, which were to follow, a new and strangely altered Attila, if we should not rather say three Attilas, gathered around themselves all kinds of weird traditions, and hovered ghost-like before the eyes of the middle ages. Some of these legends may be read in the compilation of mediæval

myths and romances prepared by Sir George W. Cox,* whose studies of comparative mythology we had occasion recently to notice. In the Etzel, for instance, of the "Nibelungenlied," we have a Teutonic reminiscence of the great Turanian chieftain; but here all that is distinctive in Attila's character disappears. The German seems to have forgotten almost everything about his mighty lord and foe, except that he dwelt by the Danube, that there was glorious feasting in his palace, and that he had relations, both in peace and war, with the Burgundians and Franks. Good nature and hospitality are Etzel's chief characteristics, and he is emphatically the commonplace personage of the story. On the other hand, the Scandinavian Atli, the husband of Gudruna in the saga of the Niblungs, is a much better copy of the original Hun. Atli is himself the cause of the death of the Niblung heroes; he plots, and diplomatizes, and kills, in order to recover the buried treasure of Sigurd, just as the real Attila moved heaven and earth for the recovery of Honoria's dowry. Moreover, the final scene in which Atli, with a certain grand calmness, discusses with the wife who has murdered him the motive for her crime, and appeals to her generosity to secure him a noble funeral, is not at all unlike what Attila might have said to his concubine Ildico, if the suspicion of the Byzantine courtiers had been correct, that he had met his death at her hand. Of course, all the details introduced in the Scandinavian or the Teutonic legends to expand and embellish the half-faded lineaments of the veritable man reflect no more light on the history of Attila than is thrown by the "Morte d'Arthur" on the thoughts and sentiments of British minds in the sixth century of our era. The version, by the way, of the Arthurian legend given by Sir George Cox is that of Sir Thomas Malory, but the interminable repetitions and tiresome descriptions of the original romance have been weeded out, and the narrative has thus been signally shortened and enlivened. It contains, however, in its present form, many important episodes which have not been treated by Tennyson or other modern poets. The reader of the "Morte d'Arthur" will obtain a very different conception of the character of King Arthur, and of the relation between Launcelot and Guinevere, than is derived from the "Idyls of the King." There is no authority here for the meeting of Arthur and his queen after the former's return from making war on Launcelot, nor is there any sign of forgiveness on his part. On the con-

* Romances of the Middle Ages, by Sir George W. Cox. New York: Henry Holt & Co.

trary, he had ordered her to be burned alive, and, according to the mediæval romance, she was rescued by Launcelot from the midst of the burning fagots. Neither would Tennyson's version of Elaine's story have been the exquisite thing it is, had he kept faithfully within the lines of the original, according to which Sir Galahad was Elaine's child by Launcelot. On the other hand, Matthew Arnold's treatment of the Tristram romance is reasonably faithful to the main features of the tale which was so popular in the middle ages. Among other legends which will be read with delight in their present dress are the lay of Beowulf, the song of Roland, the myth of Olger, or Ogier, the Dane, and the less familiar tales of Havelok, Bevis of Hamtoun, and Guy of Warwick. Nearly one half of the volume is devoted to reproductions in crisp, lively prose of the Norse sagas, the process of compression and excision being followed in each case with manifest advantage to the popular effect of the story. Most of the last-named tales, however, have been told in verse by William Morris, in "The Earthly Paradise"; and there, it is probable, most persons will prefer to read them.

III.

THE recent investigations of Mr. Oppert have directed renewed attention to the fragments of an alleged Chaldean Genesis, discovered by the late George Smith.* It will be remembered that Mr. Smith interpreted some of the records inscribed upon the cylinders and bas-reliefs which he unearthed, as relating to the fall of the first man, and affirmed that they contained the curse pronounced by the God Ea upon the Chaldean Adam after his transgression. He conceded, however, with frankness, that there were so many blanks in the evidence that positive conclusions on several points were impossible; yet, on the whole, he expressed a conviction that they would ultimately prove invaluable for the light they would throw on the Pentateuch. It was in the course of excavations at Konyunjik that the explorer came on the remarkable cuneiform tablet which was presented to the British Museum, and which, as he thought, set forth the story of man's original innocence, of the temptation, and of the fall. He subsequently found other fragments comprising nine or ten tablets at least, which he undertook to decipher, and from which he extracted a series of legends on primitive history, including the story of the

* The Chaldean Account of Genesis, by George Smith. New York: Scribners.

building of the Tower of Babel, and of the confusion of tongues. We need not say that the interest excited by these discoveries was world-wide, and that the text of the inscriptions, as they are graven on the original stones, or as they were presented in carefully executed photographs, was made the subject of intense and prolonged study on the part of the most thoroughly trained archæologists in Europe. The result has not been favorable to the discoverer's interpretation, or to the importance of the cuneiform tablets regarded as pertaining to the apparatus of Biblical criticism. Mr. Smith's translation, which was confessedly a hurried one, and in parts unintelligible, turns out to have been based on a wrong key, and to be, in consequence of that fundamental blunder, entirely erroneous. The wholly different version of the text supplied by Mr. Oppert is pronounced by competent authority to bear the marks of a scientific performance, and it is certain that the general meaning is much clearer. According to M. Lenormant, whose voice carries much weight in these matters, whatever sense may hereafter be assigned to certain obscure passages in the Babylonian inscriptions, it is now held to be established that the Smith fragments contain no reference to the original sin and the curse of man, and are quite valueless considered as a commentary on the Bible. On the other hand, there is but little doubt touching the validity of the proofs of Chaldean myths relating to a terrestrial paradise. It appears, too, that the association of a legend resembling the Biblical narrative of the temptation was associated with the cosmogonic traditions of the Chaldeans respecting the tree of life, and the paradisaical fruit. This is indicated, as distinctly as may be in the absence of written texts, by two stone cylinders of Babylonish workmanship, one of which was engraved for Mr. Smith's volume. On both of these was depicted a tree from whose spreading branches hang large fruits which, in one case, are guarded by attendant cherubim, while in the other we see a man and woman, the former wearing on his head a Babylonish turban, seated on opposite sides of the tree, and extending their hands to pluck the fruit. Behind the woman is a serpent which, as many figured monuments indicate, played the same part of tempter in Chaldaic and Phœnician legends as it assumes in Bible story. In estimating the probable significance of this image of the tree found on Chaldaic monuments, it may be well to bear in mind that the well-known Assyriologist, the Rev. A. H. Sayce, pronounces the earliest religion of Accad a species of nature-worship, which, according to his analysis, would

seem to have been developed out of ghost-worship. The presence of the snake on the Babylonish cylinder should probably be recognized as proving the persistence of serpent-worship among the Accadian people. That serpent-worship arises by identification of house-haunting snakes with returned ancestors is a theory now sanctioned by weighty scientific opinion, and confirmed by facts observed among savage races of our own time. For example, the Zulus say "The Amatongo are snakes," Amatongo being their name for ancestral ghosts. It is certain that ophiolatry prevails especially in hot countries, where certain kinds of harmless ophidia secrete themselves in dark corners of rooms, and even in beds. It is probably a mistake, however, to group together confusedly all the instances of serpent-worship into one ophiological system, as Mr. Fergusson has done, and to explain the whole upon a single principle. By the side of serpents essentially protective and benign in character, which might not unreasonably be identified with ancestors, we do unquestionably find in many mythologies a gigantic serpent, griffin, or python, who personifies a hostile and evil-working power. It is difficult, for instance, to see how the dragon in the myth of Phœnician origin which was supposed to guard the golden fruit of the Hesperides, and which was slain by Hercules, could be explained on the theory which makes the snake-cult merely a form of ancestral worship.

IV.

THE rumored visit of the King of Siam to the United States will naturally awaken some demand for books of travel relating to Farther India. One of the fullest and most readable accounts of Siam and Cambodia will be found in Mr. Thompson's narrative of a somewhat prolonged residence in those countries.* The popular and attractive form of the book might leave, at the first glance, an erroneous impression of its contents. It is enlivened here and there with the fluent, superficial gossip which forms the staple of so many tourists' journals, but even with these light strokes the author contrives to paint in a clear, effective way the outward aspect of the country, and the salient features of the Siamese character and manners. Of more substantial value is the information collected touching the history and actual situation of the Buddhist religion, which, we need not say, has kept much more of its original purity and beauty in Indo-China than elsewhere. Indeed, the father and uncle

* Malacca, Indo-China, and China, by J. Thompson. New York: Harper & Brothers.

of the reigning King were scholars of wide acquirements, being able to read the sacred writings of their faith in the original texts, and were exemplary patterns of Buddhist morality in their public and private lives. So, too, the predecessor of the crazy Prince Theebaw, who reigns, or lately reigned, in Burmah, was a noble embodiment of the typical Indian sovereign—at once priest, sage, and king. Some striking comparisons will be suggested to the reader of this volume between the spiritual qualifications of the Buddhist hierarchy, and their hold upon the popular esteem in these countries, and the different state of things in China and in Corea. In Siam the priests seem to have as much influence over all classes of society as they have in Thibet or Mongolia, but here they are far more worthy of veneration. The incompetence of the average missionary to meet the better class of Buddhist priests of Siam in theological controversy was remarked by Mr. Thompson, as it has been by most other thoroughly educated travelers. The remarkable benignity of the Buddhist faith, as disclosed in the treatment of the poor, and indeed of every living creature, receives, also, due recognition in this volume.

An important feature of Mr. Thompson's work, from an archæological point of view, is the record of his expedition into Cambodia, and investigation of the antiquities which were revealed to Europe by the French naturalist Mouhot, when, in 1861, exploring the kingdom of Siam, he came upon the Khmer ruins of Battambarg, and later upon those of Angcor, the old capital of Cambodia. Not long afterward Dr. Bastian, the German scientist, published an account of these stupendous monuments of Buddhist architecture, which are not unreasonably ascribed to the genius of some Eastern Michael Angelo. The latest properly trained explorer who has examined these remains was, we believe, Lieutenant Delaporte, whose narrative was published two years ago in the "Revue des Deux Mondes," but has not been translated into English. The most satisfactory description of the Cambodian ruins accessible to English readers will be found in Mr. Thompson's pages, which are illustrated with engravings from the author's photographs taken on the spot. The dimensions of the ruined temple known as Nakhon Wat were measured by Mr. Thompson, and they amply justify the enthusiastic expressions of M. Mouhot and other travelers. It may be rudely described as a sculptured giant pyramid rising out of dense forests and jungle-clad plains, with all the grandeur which magnitude of proportions can bestow. The temple rests upon a

stone platform, and is carried upward from its base in three quadrangular tiers with a huge central tower above all, having an elevation of one hundred and eighty feet. The outer boundary wall incloses a square space measuring nearly three fourths of a mile each way, and is surrounded by a ditch two hundred and thirty feet across. This moat is spanned on the west by a causeway of freestone, having sculptured flights of stone steps, guarded by colossal stone lions, and leading down to the water. Facing the cardinal points of the compass, and in the center of each side of the boundary wall, there are long, cloistered galleries with arched roofs and monolithic pillars. Entering the main gateway and passing up a broad inner causeway, paved like the outer one with blocks of polished freestone, you approach the western front of the temple proper. The façade on this side is more than six hundred feet in length, and is walled in for a distance of some two hundred feet, the unwalled portion consisting of open colonnades. The walled space is lighted by windows, whose stone bars are elaborately sculptured with floral ornaments. The symbolism of this temple is obscure, but Mr. Thompson concurs with the majority of archæologists in affirming Nakhon Wat to be a Buddhist edifice. Its precise purpose and date, as well as the true history of the race which reared it, will doubtless be ascertained when the inscriptions carved upon this and similar monuments shall have been made out. Mr. Thompson took impressions of some of these, but his efforts to obtain translations have hitherto been unsuccessful. He does not think it would be easy to exaggerate the magnitude and resources of the empire over which the ancient Cambodian dynasty must have reigned, or the degree of technical perfection which its artists and artisans had attained. He agrees with M. Mouhot in pronouncing Nakhon Wat grander than anything left to us by Greece or Rome. Considering that Mr. Thompson's judgment is confirmed in every point by the still later investigations of Delaporte, we must believe that a richer field for research has never been laid open than that revealed by the discovery of the magnificent remains which a vanished and nameless race have left behind them in the heart of the Cambodian wilderness.

MAYO W. HAZELTINE.

INDEX

TO THE

HUNDRED AND THIRTIETH VOLUME

OF THE

North American Review.

ALLEN, NATHAN. Divorces in New England, 547.

America, Now and Then in, 147.

AMMEN, D. M. de Lesseps and his Canal, 130.

ANONYMOUS. The Monroe Doctrine and the Isthmian Canal, 499.

ARNOLD, E. His *Light of Asia*, 92.

BELLOWS, H. W. Civil-Service Reform, 247.

Biography, Recent, 300.

BLACK, J. S. The Third Term, 197.

BLACK, J. S. General Grant and Strong Government, 417.

Blanid. By R. D. Joyce. Notice of, 97.

Bolles, A. S. His *Financial History of the United States*, 413.

BOUTWELL, GEORGE S. General Grant and a Third Term, 370.

Canada, Relations of, with the United States, 338.

Canal, The Interoceanic, 1.

Canal, Isthmian, The Monroe Doctrine and the, 499.

CARY, EDWARD. Recent Works on Trade and Finance, 407.

Caste at West Point, 604.

Catholic Church, The, and Modern Society, 101.

Chaldean Account of Genesis. By George Smith. Notice of, 620.

Civil-Service Reform, 247.

Communism of a Discriminating Income-Tax, 236.

COX, Sir G. W. His *Romances of the Middle Ages*, 619.

CURTIS, G. T. McClellan's Last Service to the Republic, 309, 462, 565.

DIDIER, E. L. Recent Biography, 300.

Divorces in New England, 547.

Emancipation Proclamation, The, 163.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 479.

Failure of the Southern Pulpit, 356.

Financial History of the United States. By A. S. Bolles. Notice of, 413.

Free Trade and English Commerce. By A. Mongredien. Notice of, 411.

Freeman, E. A. His *History of the Norman Conquest*, 512.

FROUDE, J. A. Romanism and the Irish Race in the United States, 31.

Froude's Historical Method, 280.

Grant and a Third Term, 370.

Grant, General, and Strong Government, 417.

GUSTAFSON, AXEL. Recent History and Biography, 512.

Has the Southern Pulpit failed? 585.

HAZELTINE, M. W. Recent English Books, 186.

HAZELTINE, M. W. Some Interesting Publications, 614.

HINCKS, F. Relations of Canada with the United States, 338.

History of the Norman Conquest. By E. A. Freeman. Notice of, 512.

Hodgkin, T. His *Italy and her Invaders*, 614.

Home of the Eddas. By C. G. W. Lock. Notice of, 194.

HOWE, T. O. The Third Term, 116.

Income-Tax, a Discriminating, the Communism of, 236.

Interoceanic Canal, 1.

Irish Land Question, The, 388.

Italy and her Invaders. By T. Hodgkin. Notice of, 614.

JAMES, HENRY, Jr. Sainte-Beuve, 51.

Joyce, R. D. His *Blanid*, 97.

Lamartine and his Friends. By H. de Lacretelle. Notice of, 516.

LESSEPS, F. de. The Interoceanic Canal, 1.

Lesseps, M. de, and his Canal, 130.

Letters of Charles Dickens. Notice of, 302.
Life and Works of Gilbert Stuart. Notice of, 300.
Life of Gladstone. By G. B. Smith. Notice of, 514.
Light of Asia. By E. Arnold. Notice of, 92.
Literary Notices, 92, 186, 300, 407, 512, 614.
Lock, C. G. W. His *Home of the Eddas*, 194.
McClellan's Last Service to the Republic, 309, 462, 565.
Malacca, Indo-China, and China, by J. Thompson. Notice of, 622.
MANNING, H. E. The Catholic Church and Modern Society, 101.
Memoirs of Madame de Rémusat. Notice of, 306.
Metaphysics of Science, 69.
MICHIE, PETER S. Caste at West Point, 604.
MILLS, CUTHBERT. The Permanence of Political Forces, II., 85.
Mongredien, A. His *Free Trade and English Commerce*, 411.
Monroe Doctrine and the Isthmian Canal, 499.
Müller, Max. His *Sacred Books of the East*, 186.
NEWCOMB, S. Our Political Dangers, 261.
Niccolò Machiavelli and his Times. By P. Villari. Notice of, 193.
Now and Then in America, 147.
Our Political Dangers, 261.
PARKMAN, FRANCIS. The Woman Question again, 16.
PARNELL, C. S. The Irish Land Question, 388.
Permanence of Political Forces, II., 85.
Poetical Works of Bayard Taylor. Notice of, 98.
Poetry, Recent, 92.
Political Dangers, Our, 261.
Popular Fallacies about Russia, 523.
Recent Poetry, 92.
Recent English Books, 186.
Recent Biography, 300.
Recent History and Biography, 512.
Recent Works on Trade and Finance, 407, *Reciprocity, Bi-metallism, and Land-Tenure Reform.* By A. J. Wilson. Notice of, 407.
Relations of Canada with the United States, 338.
Religion of All Sensible Men, 438.
Romances of the Middle Ages. By Sir G. W. COX. Notice of, 619.
Romanism and the Irish Race in the United States, 31.
Russia, Popular Fallacies about, 523.
Sacred Books of the East. Edited by Max Müller. Notice of, 186.
Sainte-Beuve, 51.
SALA, G. A., Now and Then in America, 147.
Science, the Metaphysics of, 69.
SHOUP, F. A. Has the Southern Pulpit failed? 585.
Smith, G. B. *His Life of Gladstone*, 514.
Smith, George. His *Chaldean Account of Genesis*, 620.
Some Interesting Publications, 614.
Southern Pulpit, Failure of the, 356.
Southern Pulpit, The, has it failed? 585.
SPALDING, J. L. Mr. Froude's Historical Method, 280.
STEPHEN, LESLIE. The Religion of All Sensible Men, 438.
STODDARD, R. H. Recent Poetry, 92.
STOUGHTON, E. W. The Third Term, 224.
STOUGHTON, E. W. Popular Fallacies about Russia, 523.
SWING, D. Failure of the Southern Pulpit, 356.
Taylor, Bayard. His *Poetical Works*, 98.
Third Term, The, 116, 197, 224, 370, 417.
Thompson, J. His *Malacca, Indo-China, and China*, 622.
UNDERWOOD, F. H. Ralph Waldo Emerson, 479.
Villari, P. His *Niccolò Machiavelli and his Times*, 193.
WELLING, J. C. The Emancipation Proclamation, 163.
WELLS, D. A. Communism of a Discriminating Income-Tax, 236.
Wilson, A. J. His *Reciprocity, Bi-metallism and Land-Tenure Reform*, 407.
WINCHELL, ALEXANDER. The Metaphysics of Science, 69.
Woman Question, The, again, 16.